

Spring 5-2012

School Counselor and Principal Perceptions Regarding the Roles of School Counselors

Tyra Terrell Bailey
University of Southern Mississippi

Follow this and additional works at: <https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations>

Recommended Citation

Bailey, Tyra Terrell, "School Counselor and Principal Perceptions Regarding the Roles of School Counselors" (2012). *Dissertations*. 515.
<https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations/515>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.

The University of Southern Mississippi

SCHOOL COUNSELOR AND PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS
REGARDING THE ROLES OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS

by

Tyra Terrell Bailey

Abstract of a Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
of The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

May 2012

ABSTRACT

SCHOOL COUNSELOR AND PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS
REGARDING THE ROLES OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS

by Tyra Terrell Bailey

May 2012

The roles of the school counselors have changed significantly over this century. Due to the pressures of high-stakes testing and budget cuts, counselors often are tasked with roles that are not aligned with state or national standards for school counseling programs (Brown, Galassi, & Akos, 2004; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001).

This study examined the differences in perceptions of the roles of school counselors by using descriptive statistics, ANOVA, MANOVA, multiple linear regression, and paired t-tests. The differences in perceptions of the roles of school counselors were found to be consistent with previous studies in some areas and inconsistent in other areas.

The findings of this study indicated that there are significant differences in the perceptions of what counselors should be doing and what they are actually doing in the areas of Counseling, Coordination, Curriculum, Consultation, and Other Activities. The results of this study suggest that middle grades school counselors and principals believe that middle grades counselors are doing more counseling tasks than high school counselors and principals perceive that high school counselors are doing. Performance level of school, grade level(s) of school, and location also were found to be statistically related to perceptions about the roles that school counselors actually perform. There were significant differences between the roles that are defined by the American School

Counseling Association (ASCA) and perceptions about the roles that counselors actually perform. Principals believe that school counselors should be performing more non-counseling duties than they are actually performing. Principals and counselors also perceive that counselors are performing fewer tasks than they should in the areas of Counseling, Coordination, Curriculum, and Consultation. Economic conditions, number of counselors and students, and years of experience did not significantly impact perceptions of the roles played by counselors. In the ancillary findings, statistically significant differences were found between what counselors and principals believed counselors should be doing and what they are actually doing in the area of coordinating the standardized testing program. From these findings, recommendations for policy, practice, and future studies were made.

COPYRIGHT BY
TYRA TERRELL BAILEY
2012

The University of Southern Mississippi
SCHOOL COUNSELOR AND PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS
REGARDING THE ROLES OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS

by

Tyra Terrell Bailey

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
of The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved:

Michael Ward
Director

Ronald Styron

David Lee

James Johnson

Ursula Whitehead

Susan A. Siltanen
Dean of the Graduate School

May 2012

DEDICATION

I would like to first thank God for giving me the opportunity, drive, determination, and time to complete this process. This work is dedicated to my husband, Ollie Bailey, Jr., who constantly encourages and supports me in all that I do. I want to thank you for standing behind me in this process. Your passion to succeed has inspired me to be the best. Completing the doctoral program could not have been accomplished without the love and support without him. He was enduring the most important and stressful year in his career, but he still managed to support my efforts in completing this goal. I love you and I thank God for you and all that you do to provide for our family.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank dissertation committee chair, Dr. Michael Ward, for his unwavering demand for excellence. His knowledge and expertise in the field of education is invaluable. His dedication, support, and encouragement allowed me to persevere and accomplish this goal. I would also like to thank the other members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Ronald Styron, Dr. David Lee, Dr. Ursula Whitehead, and Dr. James Johnson. I would like to thank Dr. Styron and Dr. Lee for lending me their insights and suggestions. I would like to thank Dr. Whitehead for guiding me in the right direction and sharing her knowledge of the school counseling profession. Her enthusiasm for the field of school counseling is simply amazing. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Johnson for his patience and expertise as a statistician.

To my precious sons, Ollie Bailey, III (Trae) and Philip “Terrell” Bailey, thank you for your patience and understanding while I was glued to the computer for countless days and nights.

To my father, Dr. Philip Terrell, thank you for setting the precedent of obtaining the highest degree in the field of education. You always encouraged me to pursue this degree even though I always said that I couldn’t write “that book.” All three of your children are now doctors in the fields of education and pharmacy. To my mother, Ruth Terrell, thank you for your sacrifices and support throughout the years, and most of all for those delicious meals and junk food you provided to your grandsons. To my sister, Dr. Tori Terrell, your determination to accomplish your goal to become a pharmacist inspired me to complete this degree. Well, to be honest, I couldn’t let you be the only “Dr.!” Lastly, but certainly not least, to my sister Dr. Tenneille Lamberth, who was right

behind me every step of the way as she also worked on completing this doctoral program, thank you for your encouragement, prayer, and support throughout this process. It was so comforting to have someone to cry and celebrate with during this stressful time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Research Questions	
Delimitations	
Assumptions	
Definition of Terms	
Justification	
Summary	
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	12
Background of the Study	
Theoretical Framework	
Pertinent Research and Professional Perspectives	
Summary	
III. METHODOLOGY	54
Research Design	
Research Questions and Hypotheses	
Participants in the Study	
Instrumentation	
Data Collection Process	
Variables in the Study	
Analysis of Data	
Summary	
IV. RESULTS	68
Results of Descriptive Analyses Related to Demographics and Research Questions	
Hypotheses Results	

	Post Hoc Analysis Summary	
V.	CONCLUSION	100
	Summary of Procedures	
	Major Findings	
	Discussion	
	Limitations	
	Recommendations for Policy and Practice	
	Recommendations for Future Research	
	Summary	
	APPENDIXES	118
	REFERENCES	131

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1.	Cronbach Alpha's for Pilot Study.....	57
2.	Cronbach Alpha's for Final Study	63
3.	Frequencies of Professional Positions	70
4.	Frequencies of Experience Levels of Counselors	70
5.	Frequencies of Experience Levels of Principals	71
6.	Frequencies of Counselors in Participants' Schools.....	72
7.	Frequencies of Students in Participants' Schools	73
8.	Frequencies of Grade Levels in Participants' Schools	75
9.	Frequencies of Faculty Members in Participants' Schools.....	76
10.	Frequencies of Location of Participants' Schools	77
11.	Frequencies of Performance Level in Participants' Schools	78
12.	Descriptives of Effects of Economic Factors.....	80
13.	Descriptive Statistics of Both Counselors and Administrators.....	82
14.	Descriptive Statistics of Counselors and Administrators.....	84
15.	Coefficients of Counseling Activities.....	86
16.	Coefficients of Consultation Activities.....	87
17.	Coefficients Curriculum Activities.....	88
18.	Coefficients of Coordination Activities	89
19.	Coefficients of Other Activities	90
20.	Descriptives of Economic Factors and Activities	92
21.	Paired Samples Test of Counseling Activities.....	95

22.	Descriptives of Middle & High School Counselors and Administrators.....	97
-----	---	----

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The profession of school counseling has existed for over 100 years. The roles of the school counselors have changed significantly over this century. Due to the pressures of high-stakes testing and budget cuts, counselors often are tasked with roles that are not aligned with state or national standards for school counseling programs (Brown, Galassi, & Akos, 2004; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). During these tough economic times, counselor positions are diminishing, especially at the elementary level (American School Counselor Association [ASCA], 2006). The purpose of this study was to analyze the differences in perceptions between principals and school counselors regarding the roles of school counselors and ascertain if the economy has affected these perceptions. The study further examined the impact of the economic downturn upon perceptions about these roles. Finally, this study also sought to determine if the roles assumed by school counselors are aligned with the ASCA model.

The ASCA model is a tool used by school counselors as a guide to implement the roles of school counselors. This model outlines the counseling program in the following areas: foundation, delivery management, and accountability (ASCA, 2005). The ASCA model and the associated standards will serve as one of the theoretical frameworks for this study. Counselors often do not advocate the roles and responsibilities outlined in this model due to the relationship with the principal in the leader-member exchange (LMX) theory. The LMX theory deals with the belief that there are differences in the quality of relationships between principals and counselors (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). When counselors do not advocate for themselves, non-counseling duties may be assigned to

them. Examples of such duties include registration, scheduling of all new students, administering achievement tests, discipline duties, and maintaining student records. These non-counseling duties can lead to role confusion (Campbell & Dahir, 2001). Moreover, role confusion can lead to low self-efficacy of the school counselor. Self-efficacy is how one perceives his or her capability of achieving a task (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). Therefore, understanding the differences in perceptions of school counselors and principals will decrease disparity between the ASCA model and roles practiced by school counselors.

The ASCA is an organization that has played a role in shaping school counseling since its inception in 1950. ASCA focuses on providing schools with professional development, enhancing school counseling programs, and researching effective school counseling practices. The vision of ASCA is to influence professional school counselors through advocacy, leadership, collaboration, and systemic change. ASCA supports school counselors by providing knowledge, skills, linkages, and resources to promote student success (ASCA, 2006). However, the ASCA model is often not implemented with fidelity.

Statement of the Problem

School counselors' roles and existence are changing. Even when counseling programs are provided, the roles of school counselors are many times misunderstood. Counselors often are given administrative duties such as testing and class scheduling (ASCA, 2006). Principals frequently request that counselors assume tasks that are outside their training and job description (White, 2007). This study will determine whether disparities in perspectives regarding the roles of counselors exist. Such

information can provide policymakers, administrators, and counselors with a foundation for reexamining the responsibilities assigned to counselors and for determining whether these roles help to increase the prospects of effective service to students. The findings of this study may better enable counselors and principals to work together as a team.

Improving student achievement is an important goal for schools. Schools across the country have worked to improve student achievement by reducing class sizes, increasing academic rigor, implementing greater accountability standards, and improving teacher preparation (ASCA, 2006). However, an important component to enhance student learning may be missing in these initiatives. School counselors often times are left out in efforts to improve student achievement (ASCA, 2006).

Administrators, teachers, students, parents, and the community often misunderstand the roles of school counselors. Practicing school counselors' perceptions of their roles are often different from the perceptions that they derived from content taught during training and outlined in the ASCA model. Principals often lack training in guidance counseling, and their perceptions regarding the roles of school counselors are often different from those of guidance counselors. A principal's perceptions of a school counselor may impact the duties assigned to them (Fitch, Newby, Ballester, & Marshall, 2001). Therefore, it is important for counselors to communicate with administrators so that the principals can understand school counselors' roles.

School counselors have contributed to the role confusion in the profession by failing to define their role in the school and the community. Thus, administrators, parents, and teachers may expect counselors to assume tasks that are not aligned with the ASCA model. When counselors are not assuming roles aligned with the ASCA model,

the school counselor's roles and functions may be misunderstood in the school and community (Campbell & Dahir, 2001).

Principals can understand school counselors' roles through the accountability standards and metrics for the guidance program that they implement in the school. Accountability for school counselors means demonstrating their effectiveness and the effectiveness of the counseling program against standards of performance (White, 2007). Accountability in implementing a school counseling program helps ensure that a high-quality, comprehensive guidance program is in place (Sink, 2009). It is recommended that accountability be demonstrated through evaluation of three dimensions: (a) composition, configuration, organization, and implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program (CSCP); (b) management and coordination of the school personnel who are responsible for CSCP implementation; and (c) level of program impact on student learning. School counseling programs should be assessed for missing elements and should also be assessed based upon whether students are developing the skills outlined in the ASCA model (i.e., career, personal-social, multicultural, and academic competencies). School counseling programs should be evaluated by students, families, teaching staff, and administrators. However, before counseling programs can be appropriately evaluated, administrators should clearly understand the needs of stakeholders and also understand the attributes of model counseling programs as outlined by ASCA (Sink, 2009).

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which was named as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLBA) of 2001 (U.S. Department of Education, 2010), defines student achievement by test scores as well as student attendance, high school completion,

college and career components, and course completion. School counselors can be used in these areas to improve student achievement. Therefore, accountability is broadened when defining student achievement.

The economy has affected education to a great extent in the last few years. Recently, Governor Haley Barbour of Mississippi released a revised budget that would cut K-12 education by \$30 million (Better Mississippi Report, 2011). This study will seek to investigate if the economic conditions have impacted the perceptions of principals and counselors regarding the roles of school counselors.

Research studies consistently indicate that school counselors can affect student achievement by having school counselors with high self-efficacy and implementing an effective comprehensive school counseling program. Role confusion has been a challenge for school counselors. Therefore, understanding the differences in perceptions of school counselors and principals may allow counselors and principals to work together to help students achieve personal, social, and career success.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a difference in perceptions between principals and school counselors regarding the roles of school counselors and if the economy has affected these perceptions. The study further assessed discrepancies between the actual roles of counselors and those recommended by ASCA. The independent variables of counselor-student ratio, number of administrators, grade levels of school, number of students, and school district also were analyzed. The dependent variables were principal and counselor perceptions of the roles of counselors. A quantitative research design was used to understand the differences in perceptions of

school counselors and principals regarding the roles of school counselors and discern the impact of the economic downturn upon these perceptions. In order to explore the variables identified in this study, the following research questions were examined:

1. Is there a difference between school counselor and principal perceptions about the roles of school counselors?
2. Are counselor and principal perceptions related to the independent variables of counselor-student ratio, grade level(s) of school, number of faculty members, location of school district, performance level of the school, years of experience as a counselor or principal, and economic condition of school district?
3. Is there a difference between how often counselors perform tasks and the severity of budget cuts?
4. Is there a difference between the roles of school counselors as defined by the ASCA and the roles that are actually performed by counselors?
5. Is there a difference in perceptions between middle grades and high school counselors and principals regarding the roles of school counselors?

The hypotheses related to the research questions were as follows:

- H₁: There is a difference between school counselor and principal perceptions about the roles of school counselors.
- H₂: Counselor and principal perceptions are related to the independent variables of counselor-student ratio, grade level(s) of school, number of faculty members, location of school district, performance level of the school, years of

experience as a counselor or principal, and economic condition of school district.

H₃: There is a difference between how often counselors perform tasks and the severity of budget cuts.

H₄: There is a difference between the roles of school counselors as defined by ASCA and the roles that are actually performed by counselors.

H₅: There is a difference in perceptions between middle grades and high school counselors and principals regarding the roles of school counselors.

Delimitations

Participants for the study were limited to school counselors and administrators who work in schools in the state of Mississippi. Also, school counselors used in the study were limited to middle and high school counselors.

Assumptions

It was assumed that all participants in the study were thorough and honest while completing the questionnaire. It was also assumed that the participants in the study had a basic understanding of the school counselor's role. Finally, it was assumed that participants completed the questionnaire without fear of potential retaliation for their responses.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were used extensively in the course of this study and are defined particularly for the context of this research.

1. Accountability. A component of the ASCA model that addresses how students are different as a result of the school counseling program by counselors to demonstrating their effectiveness by using data (ASCA, 2005).

2. American School Counseling Association (ASCA). An organization that focuses on providing schools with professional development, enhancing school counseling programs, and researching effective school counseling practices (ASCA, 2006).

3. Comprehensive School Counseling Program (CSCP). A fully developed school counseling program that promotes student achievement by incorporating leadership, advocacy, and collaboration (Dahir, Burnham, & Stone, 2009).

4. Delivery management. A component of the ASCA model that addresses how the counselor provides services to the students, staff, parents, and community.

5. Foundation. A component of the ASCA model that addresses the personal beliefs and philosophies school counselors hold regarding the school counseling program (ASCA, 2006).

6. High school. A secondary school that includes students who are in grade levels 9-12.

7. High-stakes testing. The act of assigning consequences to standardized test scores.

8. Leader member exchange theory (LMX). The belief that there are differences in the quality of relationships between principals and counselors (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

9. Middle grades. A secondary school that includes students who are in grade levels 5-8.

10. National Vocational Guidance Association (NVGA). An organization developed in 1913 composed of individuals from the fields of education, psychology, community service, business, and government (Lambie& Williamson, 2004).

11. No Child Left Behind Act (NCLBA) of 2001. A federal mandate that calls for schools to close the achievement gap and leave no child behind through high standards and accountability (U.S. Department of Education, 2010).

12. Non-counseling duties. Tasks that are not aligned with the ASCA model (ASCA, 2005). Examples of such duties include registration, scheduling of all new students, administering achievement tests, discipline duties, and maintaining student records.

13. Principal. An individual who is the educational leader of the school and for purposes of this study, an assistant principal will also be referenced as a principal.

14. Role confusion. The act of not understanding the tasks that school counselors should perform.

15. Self-efficacy. One's perceived ability to achieve a given task (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005).

16. Student achievement. The measurement of what a student has learned during the course of a school year by the administration of standardized tests.

17. Transforming School Counselor Initiative (TSCI). A program that calls for counselors to play a more active role in identifying and addressing barriers to student

learning and encouraging counselors to be advocates of change within their school (McMahon, Mason, & Paisley, 2009).

Justification

The roles of school counselors have been researched for many years. Researchers have sought to understand the differences in perceptions regarding school counselors among students, teachers, students, counselors, and principals. Many counselors perform tasks that are not aligned with the ASCA model, and researchers have conducted many studies to identify the reasons for this non-alignment. Many times the non-alignment is due to the financial status of a school. Research on the link between the roles of school counselors and the financial status of schools is limited. This study sought to expand the research on the relationship between the economy and the roles of school counselors.

While noting the misalignment between recommended counseling roles and their actual duties, counselors, at times, try to demonstrate their value by assuming tasks that are administrative (Anderson & Reiter, 1995). For example, high-stakes testing is affecting school districts across the country. Many school counselors are tasked with being test administrators. Conducting non-counseling duties, such as being a test administrator, keeps counselors from performing traditional counseling roles (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). This study will allow counselors and principals to better understand the roles of school counselors as outlined in the ASCA model.

Summary

School counselor roles have gradually changed over the years. Many counselor roles are changing into administrative roles due to budget cuts (ASCA, 2006). The ASCA model provides standards for counselors to implement a school counseling

program. This model also provides a set of roles for school counselors. However, research studies indicate that different perceptions of the roles of school counselors exist. School counselors can demonstrate their effectiveness by using accountability measures. Hopefully, this study produced findings that may enable counselors and principals to work together as a team to assist students in achieving personal, social, and career success.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Research has been conducted for years regarding the roles of school counselors. The purpose of this chapter is to provide a background of how the roles of school counselors evolved, the theories that affect school counseling, and extensive literature on the perceptions of the roles of school counseling and how it affects students.

In 2003, the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) developed a model for school counselors that outlined the roles of school counselors. This chapter explains that many school counselors have not been successful in following the model due to role confusion. Role confusion has led counselors to conduct non-counseling duties assigned by administrators. Within this chapter, research is described that details conclusions regarding school counselors and their roles in education. Additionally, this chapter describes how school counselors affect student achievement and how school counselors can demonstrate their effectiveness through accountability.

Background of the Study

One of the roles of school counselors is to remove barriers that impede student learning. The ASCA developed the ASCA National Model in order to help counselors accomplish this goal. However, throughout the years school counselors have encountered obstacles when trying to achieve this task. Administrators are often the individuals who assign duties to counselors. In the hierarchy of a school, traditionally school counselors are often not seen as leaders. This tradition may hinder counselors from being an advocate for themselves. New reforms and initiatives have changed the

way schools operate as a whole regarding school counseling programs and placed counselors in more leadership roles.

School counselors, counselor educators, and others have tried to advocate ways to define school counselors, encouraged them to accept leadership roles within the schools, and prompted them to work together to help all students succeed (DeVoss & Andrews, 2006; House & Hayes, 2002; House & Martin, 1998). The ASCA model and the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) are based on the belief that all children can be successful in schools. The ASCA model and the TSCI call for school counselors to play a more active role in identifying and addressing barriers to student learning. ASCA and TSCI call for counselors to use skills of advocacy, collaboration, data use, and leadership in order to make this change happen. The initiation of TSCI, advocacy, and collaboration has become a common topic in school counseling (Baker & Gerler, 2004). One of the ideals of TSCI was to encourage counselors to be advocates of this change within their own schools (McMahon et al., 2009). Stone and Dahir (2006) described leadership as a simple skill and mindset in which school counselors work.

In order for this change to be successful, counselor educators will have to better prepare future counselors to practice in a way that is aligned with the new vision. It may not be enough to just change the counselor preparation curriculum. This change would benefit future counselors by enabling them to work more with school counselors who practice the ideals of the new initiative. School counselor educators have played active roles in researching, presenting at conferences, and running for office within school counseling organizations. However, school counselor educators should see themselves as leaders beyond school counseling; they should see themselves as leaders in the larger

field of education. There has been a debate on whether practicing school counselors should be more involved in counseling in education. It is believed that school counselors should serve as counselors and educators (Paisley, Ziomek-Daigle, Getch, & Bailey, 2006). These dual roles call for counselor educators to be more active in the way they teach counseling so that the jobs will be aligned with what they are teaching (McMahon et al., 2009). School counselors also will have to embrace this new initiative by expanding their skills set and redefining the role that they play in schools (Paisley & Milsom, 2007).

School counselors have been called to be leaders in the task of developing all students. They are responsible for delivering the programmatic services to support the academic, career, and personal/social development of all students through school counseling programs. However, research suggests many barriers exist that prevent effective programmatic delivery of services; such barriers include role inconsistencies, lack of administrative support, and fear of failure and risk-taking (Dollarhide, Gibson, & Saginak, 2008). In order to overcome these challenges, counselors are encouraged to take leadership roles in their schools. The ASCA model recommends that all counselors hold leadership roles in their schools in order to support academic achievement. The ASCA competencies state that an effective school counselor serves as a leader in the school and community in order to support student success (Shillingford & Lambie, 2010).

Research notes the importance of school counselors' values, leadership practices, and school counseling programmatic service delivery in order to ensure student success (Posner & Kouzes, 1988; Scarborough, 2005; Schwartz, 1992). Values can be defined as what is important to a school counselor. A counselor's values may influence personal

actions and also may influence his or her choice in delivering services to students. Effective leadership involves taking risks, developing a vision, collaborating with others, and facilitating the implementation of program goals and activities (Kouzes & Posner, 1999). Kouzes and Posner (2003) identified five “fundamental practices that enable leaders to get extraordinary things done” (p. 9). The five leadership practices are challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart. School counselors must use these leadership practices to influence their programmatic service delivery. The ASCA model provides an outline for a programmatic delivery of services. The practices include counseling, consulting, collaboration, and curriculum delivery (Shillingford & Lambie, 2010).

The current state of economy of school districts is of concern to school counseling programs. Many states across the country have experienced drastic budget cuts in education. School counseling programs have been affected by these cuts. If school counselors do not explore accountability practices, programs will continue to diminish (Dorgan, 2008). Counselors strive to demonstrate their value to education through accountability. Anderson and Reiter (1995) questioned whether counselors could remain in the educational system. Counselors often complete tasks that are not aligned with the ASCA model in order to demonstrate their value. Demonstrating their value through accountability metrics will reduce the likelihood that, in a difficult budget climate, their programs might be cut or diminished. However, when counselors complete tasks that are administrative, this leads to role confusion (Campbell & Dahir, 2001).

A brief history of how school counseling evolved will be discussed in order to understand how the roles of school counselors have changed over the years. ASCA has

played a vital role in advocating for school counselors. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and many other initiatives have changed the roles of school counselors.

History of School Counseling

Many ideals are defined by their histories and the realities of an event, institution, or person who is socially developed (Freedman & Combs, 1996). School counseling has its own history. Counseling began at the turn of the 20th century. It was very different from what is currently advocated by ASCA's (2008) current professional role statement. During this time immigrants were traveling to the United States to find better opportunities. The United States was greatly immersed in the Industrial Revolution, a period of time that yielded not only the rapid expansion of manufacturing but also significant demands for social reform. Pressures for school reform also emerged, including those related to guidance and counseling services.

Frank Parsons is often credited with being the father of vocational guidance. Parsons and many other key individuals sought to ensure that schools provided the type of education needed in forming the new society. Parsons focused on helping young men transition to appropriate career placement based on their abilities and aptitudes (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). The primary role of counselors was vocational. The profession of vocational guidance involved roles that can be compared to current career counseling with a focus on transitioning from school to work (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). However, other tasks became a part of school counselors' roles (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001).

Persons involved in education, social work, and psychometrics in vocational guidance came together to organize the National Vocational Guidance Association

(NVGA) in 1913 (Super, 1955). This organization was composed of individuals from the fields of education, psychology, community service, business, and government. The NVGA merged with the American College Personnel Association, the National Association of Guidance Supervisors and Counselor Trainers, and the Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education and became the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA). This organization now is known as the American Counseling Association (ACA). Therefore, the development of the NVGA was significant to the development and the process of school counseling being recognized as a profession (Lambie & Williamson, 2004).

World War I played a vital role in the evolution of school counseling. The need emerged for psychological assessments for individuals who were being drafted for various positions. These assessments also were found to be valuable in the schools. Vocational guidance then spread throughout the country (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). Selected teachers were appointed to the position of vocational counselor. However, they were still responsible for their teaching duties and received no additional compensation (Ginn, 1924).

In the 1920s and 1930s, counselors began to expand on their roles of vocational counseling by incorporating social, personal, and educational components for students. Funds for counseling programs began to diminish during the Great Depression in the 1930s. However, the George Dean Act allowed an increase in funding for vocational and career fields in 1938 (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001).

In the 1920s, John Dewey introduced the cognitive developmental movement. Dewey (as cited in Lambie & Williamson, 2004) proposed that people moved through

different stages of development and that in order for children to be successful, they must be provided different stimulating experiences during different periods. With this statement, Dewey emphasized the school's role in cognitive, personal, social, and moral development. Based on Dewey's work, guidance strategies were implemented into the curriculum in order to support students' needs (Lambie & Williamson, 2004).

Several events impacted school counseling in the 1940s and 1950s. Carl Rogers, the father of counseling more than likely had the greatest impact on the development of the counseling profession (Schmidt, 2003). Rogers influenced professionals such as counselors, psychologists, and school counselors by seeing individuals as people and not just problems. After the work of Carl Rogers, the term *guidance* was replaced in literature by the word *counseling* (Cobia & Henderson, 2003). The Vocational Education Act of 1946, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and the development of the ASCA were major factors that shaped guidance counseling in schools. Schools began to hire guidance counselors as full-time practitioners. During this time period six services were identified: (a) orientation, (b) assessment, (c) information, (d) counseling, (e) placement, and (f) follow-up (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001).

Counseling in Contemporary Schools

The concept of implementing guidance and counseling in order for students to develop academically, socially, and emotionally began to emerge in the 1970s (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). School counselors would meet with students to adhere to their counseling needs. However, counselors were having a difficult time demonstrating effectiveness via measurable outcomes due to the confidentiality of their interactions with students. School counselors cannot discuss another client's issues except under extreme

circumstances. Therefore, counselors had a tough time demonstrating accountability. Administrators began to cut positions due to budget reductions and counselors were asked to perform additional administrative roles (Mercer, 1981). The Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975 increased the services that guidance counselors provided to students (Baker, 2000; Schmidt, 2003). This Act extended school counselors' role in special education programs (Humes, 1978).

Guidance counseling programs continued to evolve in the 1980s and 1990s. The National Commission on Excellence in Education published *A Nation at Risk* in 1983 (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). This report recognized a decline in student achievement and promoted the implementation of reform initiatives in order to increase student achievement. Educators' reaction to this report advanced the accountability and testing movement, which strongly influenced school counselors. The School to Work Opportunities Act of 1994 reinforced the importance of career guidance and counseling services in order to help students transition from school to the workforce (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). In 1990, ASCA (2003) helped advocated that the profession of school counseling transition from the previous title of guidance counseling. After this transition, many school counselors began identifying themselves as professional school counselors.

The implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLBA) of 2001 necessitated changes in assessment practices. Schools needed someone to organize testing, and counselors were very frequently assigned this role. However, this responsibility left them with less time to focus on traditional counseling roles (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). Administrators often task school counselors with non-counseling

duties that have led to role confusion. In 2003, the ASCA developed the *ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Program*. This document called for school counselors to use accountability as a measure to demonstrate their effectiveness. Counselors still are battling the role confusion in their profession (ASCA, 2008).

Theoretical Framework

In 2003, the ASCA developed the *ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Program*; the model asserted that school counselors need to use data-based decision making (ASCA, 2008). This National Model consists of professional attributes in the following areas: foundation, delivery, management, and accountability. Foundation can be described as the personal beliefs and philosophies that school counselors hold regarding the program. Delivery is how the counselor provides services to the students, staff, parents, and community. Management focuses on using tools that are reflective of the school's needs. Lastly, accountability focuses on how counselors demonstrate the effectiveness of the school counseling program. This model has aided practitioners as they implement the roles of guidance counselors in a more systematic and thorough manner (ASCA, 2006). Therefore, the ASCA model, along with the related standards, will serve as one of the theoretical frameworks for this study.

ASCA Model

The ASCA National Model is divided into the following four parts: foundation, delivery, management, and accountability. The foundation area of the ASCA model lays the groundwork of what students should know and be able to do. Stakeholders should work together in order to build a strong foundation. During the development stage,

parents, staff, and the community are involved when laying the foundation for the school counseling program (ASCA, 2005).

The components of the program's foundation include beliefs, philosophies, mission statements, and ASCA National Standards for student career, academic, and personal/social development. The beliefs of school counselors are personal and differ individually. The beliefs of people regarding students, families, teachers, and education are important aspects in ensuring success for all students. The beliefs of these individuals form the philosophy of the school counseling program. Then, a mission statement will be created based on the philosophy of the school counseling program. The mission statement should allow the school counseling program to create a vision and basis in the face of change. School counseling programs should have clear, measurable goals in the domains of academic development, career development, and personal/social development in order to lay a solid foundation for a school counseling program (ASCA, 2005).

After the foundation is laid, the delivery section of the ASCA National Model focuses on how the school counseling program will be delivered. Aspects of the delivery system include the school guidance curriculum, individual student planning, responsive services, and system support. The school guidance curriculum serves as a written tool that is preventative and a proactive measure for the development of students that is organized and delivered by school counselors. The individual student planning aspect allows all students the opportunity to work closely with their parents in order to create personal goals. The responsive services aspect allows counselors to respond to students' needs through individual counseling, group counseling, crisis counseling, referrals, and consultation. The system support aspect allows school counselors to use their leadership

and advocacy skills to promote change. School counselors also act as a support through professional development, consultation, and collaboration of all stakeholders (ASCA, 2005).

The management aspect addresses the organizational tools and processes needed to maintain and manage a school counseling program. This aspect focuses on the use of action plans, calendars, and data and who will implement the program, management agreements, and advisory councils. Management is a team effort of working together and determining the assignment of counselors. The principal must be involved in this decision-making. An advisory council is a group of people appointed to advise and assist the school counseling program. The counselor's purpose is to make reviews and recommendations regarding the school counseling program (ASCA, 2005).

The principal or school counseling administrator should be involved. An advisory council is a representative group of people appointed to advise and assist the school counseling program by making reviews and recommendations. Data are an essential element of a successful school counseling program. Data allows individuals to ensure that all students are receiving benefits of the school counseling program. An action plan must be put into place to ensure time is allocated for all components of the school counseling program. Calendars are useful in making sure all stakeholders, including students, parents, teachers, administrators, and the community, are aware of school counseling events (ASCA, 2005).

Accountability is the last component of the ASCA national model. Accountability addresses the impact (i.e., how the students are different) of the school counseling program. It has become very important for counselors to demonstrate the

effectiveness of the programs they implement. Accountability can be accomplished by collecting data that reflect successful student outcomes. The components of the accountability system include results reports, school counselor performance standards, and the program audit. The result reports are used to demonstrate how students are different due to the school counseling program. Collecting data allows schools to measure the effectiveness of the school counseling program. The program audits can be used as a tool to analyze each of the program's components by identifying each area of strength and weakness. These audits can demonstrate alignment with ASCA's National Model and the 13 standards that are expected of school counselors (ASCA, 2005).

The ASCA has had a major impact on the school counseling field since its inception in 1950 (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). Before ASCA, the number of school counselors was small (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). However, the number of school counselors has increased dramatically. ASCA serves over 28,000 school counseling professionals. ASCA focuses on providing schools with professional development, enhancing school counseling programs, and researching effective school counseling practices. The vision of ASCA is to influence professional school counselors through advocacy, leadership, collaboration, and systemic change. ASCA intends to empower professional school counselors with the knowledge, skills, linkages, and resources to promote student success (ASCA, 2006). However, the ASCA model often is not implemented due to role confusion.

The initial introduction of the ASCA model took place in 2003. Since then counselor associations and state departments of education have published second-generation documents that are aligned with the ASCA National Model. Recent studies

have shown that students who participate in comprehensive school counseling programs benefit academically, behaviorally, and socially (Dahir et al., 2009). ASCA (2005) revised the role of the professional school counselor to reinforce the importance of the comprehensive school counseling program and emphasize the skills that are necessary to implement the program. The comprehensive school counseling program should promote student achievement by incorporating leadership, advocacy, and collaboration (Dahir et al., 2009).

The changes in the school counseling profession over the last 10 years have led researchers to ask if school counselors have acquired the attitudes and skills necessary to successfully implement a comprehensive school counseling program. Many states do not offer workshop and training opportunities that support the ASCA model. A few states have a statewide professional development plan for this initiative (Dahir et al., 2009).

Leader-Member Exchange Theory

The leader-member exchange theory (LMX) states that leaders develop relationships with each of their subordinates through various work-related exchanges (Graen & Cashman, 1975; Graen & Scandura, 1987). The nature of the relationship ranges from low LMX relationships, which are exchanges that are directly specified by the employment contract, and high LMX relationships, which extend beyond what is required for employment (Liden & Maslyn, 1998). Many theorists have argued that LMX should be treated as a multidimensional construct, which would provide a more complete description of the relationships (Dienesch & Liden, 1986; Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997). Traditionally, theorists have treated the LMX as a unidimensional

construct (Graen & Cashman, 1975; Graen, Novak, & Sommerkamp, 1982; Graen & Scandura, 1987).

An issue regarding the LMX theory is how it should be measured. Typically, LMX has been measured from the subordinate's perspective (Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994). However, assessing LMX from only one perspective may provide inaccurate depiction of the LMX relationship. Several researchers have argued that the LMX should be measured from both the subordinate and the supervisor (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Scandura & Schriesheim, 1994; Schriesheim, Neider, & Scandura, 1998). Initially, measurement scales for the LMX theory mirrored each other (e.g., whether or not the supervisor recognizes the subordinate's potential). However, the mirroring approach fails to capture the exchanges that are intended by the LMX theory (Liden & Maslyn, 1998; Sparrowe & Liden, 1997).

The LMX theory has been explored in the relationship of supervisors and subordinates; its relationship to job satisfaction has also been studied. LMX implies that the higher the quality of the relationship of supervisors and subordinates, the more they share in mutual trust, respect, and obligation (Graen & Schieman, 1978). Several researchers have linked high LMX to higher organizational support and higher performance (Dunegan, Uhl-Bien, & Duchon, 2002; Graen & Cashman, 1975; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997).

According to Amatea and Clark (2005), principals have a significant influence in shaping the roles of school counselors. Researchers have used the LMX theory to observe principal-counselor relationships in the aspects of role definition, job satisfaction, and turnover rate. The LMX theory deals with the belief that there are differences in the

qualities of relationships between leaders and the individuals whom they oversee (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Even though principals have influence on shaping the roles of counselors, counselors can also influence these roles (Amatea & Clark, 2005). The LMX theory provides a foundation for the hypothesis that regardless of what a principal conceptualizes for the practitioner's role, the quality of the relationship is associated with how the practitioner's role is negotiated within a school (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1991, 1995). Principals who share decision making with counselors are considered to have a higher-quality relationship. Counselors then will be more likely to advocate for themselves (Paglis & Green, 2002).

Self-Efficacy

Role confusion and the different perceptions about counselors' duties can affect the self-efficacy of school counselors. Self-efficacy is one's perceived capability of achieving a given task (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). These beliefs can shape the foundation for motivation, well-being, and personal accomplishments in all aspects of life (Bandura, 1997). School counselors may have lower self-efficacy if they are not performing the tasks they believe constitute the exemplary practice, e.g., the tasks outlined in the ASCA model. A counselor's perceptions of his or her ability to be a successful practitioner affect the counselor as an individual as well as the students with whom he or she is working. A student who is working with a counselor with high self-efficacy can achieve significant gains in the areas of self-confidence, motivation, and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). It is important to increase the self-efficacy of school counselors by closing the gap between the perceptions of school counselors and

principals regarding the roles of school counselors. By closing the gap, counselors can be used more effectively in a fully implemented school counseling program.

The first self-efficacy scale that was developed for school counselors was the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (CSS) (Sutton & Fall, 1995). This tool was a 33-item scale that was devised from the teacher self-efficacy scale. Sutton and Fall collected data from school counselors using the CSS, and a relationship was found between counselor self-efficacy and school climate. School climate included colleague support and principal support. Sutton and Fall (1995) also found that the counselors with higher self-efficacy had higher expectations for the outcome of their services, which aligned with the roles of school counselors rather than services that were not aligned.

Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) developed the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSE), a self-efficacy scale specifically designed for school counselors. When the SCSE was developed, there was no validated self-efficacy scale in use in professional school counseling. Self-efficacy is a new area of theory and research. This scale created the need to explore how counseling self-efficacy affects counselor performance (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). The SCSE also can help counselors understand their personal self-efficacy.

This theoretical framework suggests there are many causes that affect how school counselors and principals perceive the roles of school counselors. The theories used in this study, self-efficacy, the strength of the relationship between the counselor and principal (LMX theory), and the roles that are outlined by the ASCA model, have been synthesized in order to explain the potential disconnect between the perceptions of the roles of school counselors. The perceptions of school counselors and principals are very

much affected by the different experiences and the exposure of each individual as indicated in the theoretical framework.

Pertinent Research and Professional Perspectives

Administrators' and School Counselors' Perceptions of the Roles of School Counselors

School counselors are often involved in activities that are not related to their training or what is determined profession by the profession to be appropriate roles (Baker, 1996). Participating in disciplinary functions, performing clerical duties, and scheduling take up a lot of a school counselor's time. However, these are not duties outlined in the model for the roles of school counselors (ASCA, 2008; Baker, 1996; Ballard & Murgatroyd, 1999; Gysbers & Henderson, 1994; Murray, 1995; Schmidt, 1999). Because counselors are spending time doing non-counseling duties, it compromises the time that they are able to do the duties associated with the training the counselor received, state standards, and national standards. Some of the areas of counseling that have been neglected due to performing non-counseling tasks are individual counseling, group counseling, classroom guidance, program coordination, and consultation (Baker, 1996).

Many authors have discussed the topic of school counselors spending time on non-counseling functions (Fitch, Newby, Ballesterro, & Marshall, 2001; Kaplan, 1995; Scruggs, Wasielewski, and Ash, 1999). Studies have shown that school counselors and principals have different views of the roles of school counselors (Fitch, Newby, Ballesterro, & Marshall, 2001). Administrators often delegate the roles of the school counselor. Therefore, the duties of the counselors are not aligned with state and national role statements. This can cause role confusion and become very frustrating for school

counselors and administrators (Kaplan, 1995). A study by Scruggs, Wasielewski, and Ash (1999) highlighted the allocation of the school counselor's time. Parents, staff, and secondary students were polled in a K-12 school. Only 52% of the polled parents, 76% of the staff, and 57% of the secondary students believed that the counselors worked on appropriate tasks (Scruggs et al., 1999).

Administrators have expanded their knowledge of school counseling programs throughout the years. However, some administrators base their actions relative to the counseling program on their own experience of counselors when they were in school (Coy, 1999). Graduate programs in educational leadership do not always require courses in school counseling. These graduate programs also do not necessarily focus on the role of school counselors in a comprehensive school counseling program. Because school administrator programs are not focused on the roles of school counselors, counselors may perceive that their supervisors lack the knowledge of appropriate school counselor roles. Counselors need to be aware that their administrators may expect them to do non-counseling duties. Counselor educators in graduate programs should train counselors on how to address the situation (Fitch, Newby, Ballester, & Marshall, 2001).

National role standards clearly indicate what roles are appropriate. However, there is a widespread perception that the role statements are not always followed (Baker & Gerler, 2004; Schiarra, 2004; Schmidt, 2003). Principals often determine the tasks that are given to counselors. Therefore, their perceptions of the school counselor's role have a major impact on the tasks that are assigned. Extensive research has been conducted on the extent to which principals endorse the ASCA counselor role standards. The research

indicates that principals have been inconsistent (Fitch et al., 2001; McDowell, 1995; Partin, 1990; Schmidt, Weaver, & Aldredge, 2001; Stickel, 1990).

Coy (1999) believed that universities often offer at least one course on counseling as a part of a degree in educational administration. Beale and McCay (2001) and Fitch et al. (2001) believed that a course such as this is uncommon. A course was offered at the University of Puget Sound for several years. This course was required for both administrators and counselors-in-training. The course focused on familiarizing each role to the other. The purpose of the study was to determine how counselors and administrators who had taken the course and were currently practicing perceived the roles of the school counselor. The researchers found that both the administrators and the counselors agreed on the roles that were congruent with state and national standards. However, they did not agree on the roles that were incongruent with state and national standards. The administrators were more likely than the counselors to endorse the role statements that were incongruent with state standards. Shoffner and Williamson (2000) also developed a seminar in order to train students on both roles. Research suggests that it is very difficult to change perceptions without experience. One can teach individuals in a training program which counseling roles should be implemented. However, once the individual is practicing, the demands of the work setting may impose on both roles (Kirchner & Setchfeld, 2005). Research suggests that future administrators should know the roles that are important for counselors to implement (Fitch et al., 2001).

Principals have great influence on the environment in schools. What principals value will greatly influence the behaviors assigned to their subordinates (Baker & Gerler, 2004). In other words, principals control whether school counselors perform the roles

advocated by the ASCA. Some research shows that the successfulness of a school counseling program is greatly determined by the principal's support of the school counselor's efforts. Therefore, ASCA recommends that principals and school counselors work together as a team to ensure that all students' needs are met (Chata & Loesch, 2007).

Perusse, Goodnough, Donegan, and Jones (2004) studied the emphasis on the idea that school counselors should follow the ASCA national standards. Perusse et al. (2004) found that 80% of the participating principals believed that non-counseling duties, such as registration, scheduling of all new students, administering achievement tests, and maintaining student records, were appropriate even though they were not endorsed by the ASCA. However, Chata and Loesch's (2007) study was conducted with future administrators to see if they favored ASCA-recommended school counselor roles over inappropriate roles not endorsed by the school counseling profession. Chata and Loesch contradicted the generalization that administrators do not support the roles that ASCA advocates. This study implies that school counselor promotional efforts have been successful and that school counselor advocates need to continue to promote the school counseling profession to educational administrators (Chata & Loesch, 2007). However, according to Kirchner and Setchfeld (2005), one can teach future administrators the proper roles of school counselors, but often the demands of the work setting prompt practitioners in both roles to behave in a manner that is inconsistent with these roles.

Understanding the benefits of implementing ASCA's national model for school counseling programs affects the success of a school counseling program. When principals and counselors do not understand the roles and responsibilities of school

counselors, too many non-counseling duties may be assigned to the counselor (Nelson, Robles-Pina, & Nichter, 2008). Non-counseling duties have been the topic of many research studies (Baker & Gerler, 2004; Schiarra, 2004; Schmidt, 2003). The new vision for the school counseling profession is based on 13 performance standards that are listed in the accountability section of ASCA's national model. School counselors should perform the following standards in order to meet professional standards.

Standard 1: The professional school counselor plans, organizes, and delivers the school counseling program.

Standard 2: The professional school counselor implements the school guidance curriculum through the use of effective instructional skills and careful planning of structured group sessions for students.

Standard 3: The professional school counselor implements the individual planning component by guiding individuals and groups of students and their parents through the development of educational and career planning.

Standard 4: The professional school counselor provides responsive services through the effective use of individual and small-group counseling, consultation and referral services.

Standard 5: The professional school counselor proves system support through effective school counseling program management and support for other educational programs.

Standard 6: The professional school counselor discusses the counseling department management system and the program action plans with the school administrator.

Standard 7: The professional school counselor is responsible for establishing and convening an advisory council for the school counseling program.

Standard 8: The professional school counselor collects and analyzes data to guide program direction and emphasis.

Standard 9: The professional school counselor monitors the students on a regular basis as they progress in school.

Standard 10: The professional school counselor uses time and calendar to implement an efficient program.

Standard 11: The professional school counselor develops a results evaluation for the program; conducts a yearly program audit.

Standard 12: The professional school counselor advocates for students.

Standard 13: The professional school counselor is a leader, collaborator and a systems change agent. (ASCA, 2005, p. 63).

High school counselors are involved in many office clerical duties, such as writing recommendations, transcript evaluation, and data entry. These counselors engage less in large group guidance because of these clerical duties. High school counselors are more likely than elementary counselors to perform non-clerical duties. A study by Nelson et al. (2008) was conducted using 475 high school counselors from Texas. The School Counselor Activity Rating Scale (SCARS) was the instrument used in this study. The SCARS instrument is intended to measure how counselors actually spend their time versus how they would prefer to spend their time. Nelson et al. found that counselors actually do few activities related to counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination. However, counselors would prefer to do more of these activities and less of

the clerical activities. The high school counselors who participated in the study indicated that too much time was spent on non-counseling duties (Nelson et al., 2008). When counselors conduct non-counseling duties, the ability to deliver effective services to students is limited (Lapan, Gysbers, & Kayson, 2007).

Teacher Perceptions

Teachers play a vital role in the success of a school counseling program. It is important to have teachers' support for the program. Research has been limited on teacher perceptions of school counselors. A study by Remley and Albright (1988) focused on the teachers' opinions about a variety of counseling duties. These researchers found that the teachers appreciated the role of school counselors. However, the teachers believed that the delivery of the services needed to be improved (Remley & Albright). Clark and Amatea (2004) stated that the expectations and the knowledge that teachers have may affect counselors' performance and the counseling program. Teachers influence the perceptions of others such as principals, students, and parents. A qualitative study was conducted that involved 23 teachers as participants. The teachers believed that communication and collaboration were the most important tasks held by school counselors (Reiner, Colbert, & Perusse, 2009).

Reiner et al. (2009) recently conducted a study to address whether or not teachers support the roles defined by ASCA and examine how teachers perceive school counselors and their time. The results indicated that teachers agreed with 13 of the 16 appropriate tasks and only 5 of 12 inappropriate activities. These results suggested that teachers agree with the roles assigned by the ASC and that the high school teachers would be supportive of counselors who want to engage with the roles aligned with the ASCA

National Model. The teachers agreed with some of the inappropriate activities and believed that the counselors were conducting these clerical duties. Even though the teachers agreed with 13 of the 16 appropriate tasks, they did not believe that the counselors in their building were engaging in the tasks often or consistently. School counselors need to be aware of how their own stakeholders perceive them as counselors and may have an impact on the success of the school counseling program. If school counselors are not engaging in tasks that are perceived as valuable, they could be viewed as being ineffective (Reiner et al., 2009).

Teachers have a lot to offer a comprehensive guidance program (Ginter, Scalise, & Presse, 1990; Myrick, 2003) due to their historical connection in today's schools with student achievement (Baker & Gerler, 2004; Muro & Kottman, 1995; Myrick, 2003). Beesley (2004) investigated how satisfied teachers are with the school counseling services at their school. The results indicated that 67% of teachers were extremely satisfied with the counseling services. Several areas of counseling were rated as *needed improvement*, including career counseling, academic planning/college preparation, community referrals, and public relations (Beesley, 2004).

Role Confusion

The ASCA (2005) made the following statement regarding the roles of school counselors:

The professional school counselor is a certified/licensed educator trained in school counseling with unique qualifications and skills to address all students' academic, personal/social and career development needs. Professional school counselors implement a comprehensive school counseling program that promotes

and enhances student achievement. Professional school counselors are employed in elementary, middle/junior high and high schools and in district supervisory, counseling education and post-secondary settings. Their work is differentiated by attention to developmental stages of student growth, including the needs, tasks and student interests related to those stages. Professional school counselors uphold the ethical and professional standards of professional counseling associations and promote the development of the school counseling program based on the following areas of the ASCA National Model: foundation, delivery, management and accountability. (p. 11)

This broad definition has been a factor in the role confusion of school counselors.

Counselors are engaging in activities that are not aligned with the ASCA model.

Role confusion has caused counselors to turn away from the programmatic delivery of services outlined in the ASCA model. The delivery of services is broken down into four components: counseling, coordination, consulting, and curriculum. Counselors should provide small-group and individual counseling to students who have personal concerns or difficulties in relationships. Counselors consult with parents, teachers, and individuals in the community in order to help students achieve personally/ socially, academically, and emotionally. School counselors also use a curriculum to conduct classroom lessons to students. Lastly, school counselors are responsible for coordination activities, which include coordinating, and maintaining the comprehensive developmental school counseling program (ASCA, 2005; Gysbers& Henderson, 2001; Scarborough, 2005).

During the 1970's, enrollment in schools was decreasing; this had a dramatic effect on school counselors. Mercer (1981) described how counselors' role changed due to the declining enrollment. Before the enrollment declined, the counselor's role was to counsel students behind closed doors. However, it was difficult to assess the counselors' outcomes due to confidentiality of the sessions. Administrators then began to eliminate counselors due to budget cuts. Because of these actions, school counselors began to take on additional roles in order to assist administrators and be more visible in their roles. These additional roles were often administrative and led to many of the non-counseling roles that counselors are performing today (Lambie & Williamson, 2004).

School counselors are heavily involved in the high-stakes testing program due to the significant awards and punishments associated with success or failure on such assessments. It can be difficult to pinpoint the beginning of the reform of the educational system. However, the publication *A Nation at Risk* maybe one of the factors for the education reform. High-stakes testing has been put into place for accountability measures and to ensure that all students have a high-quality education. Many studies have been conducted on the effects of testing on teachers and student learning. However, research on the effect on school counselors has been limited (Brown, Galassi, & Akos, 2004).

Two studies were conducted to examine the perceptions of the school counselors and the North Carolina testing program. Study 1 consisted of 141 counselors who participated in the state's school counseling conference. Study 2 consisted of a random sample of 139 counselors who were members of the state school counseling program. Eighty percent or more counselors reported that a counselor serves as the school's testing

coordinator and these tasks consumed a great deal of their time. The counselors noted that the high-stakes testing program had positive effects. However, it negatively affected their ability to perform services and impacted the relationships with students, teachers, and administrators (Brown et al., 2004).

Monteiro-Leitner, Asner-Self, Milde, Leitner, and Skelton (2006) examined the perceptions of school counselors-in-training, school counselors, and principals regarding the school counselors' current and expected roles in various rural midwestern school districts. The results indicated that there were statistically significant differences that existed among the three groups. However, in practical terms, the differences were small. The study found that counselors, future counselors, and principals have different perceptions of how much time school counselors actual spend on specific school counseling duties and how much time should be spent. Monteiro-Leitner et al. suggested some reasons for the role confusion are as follows: (a) All stakeholders do not exactly know what a school counselor's role is and when they do, they do not always agree on the roles; (b) the power given to the administrator can affect the relationship with the school counselor and make it difficult for the counselor to be empowered; and (c) consideration should be given to the economic, regional, local, and individual student needs when changing the daily function of school counselors (Monteiro-Leitner, et al., 2006).

Student Achievement

Research studies have shown that school counseling programs can benefit students' academic performance, satisfaction with school, and grades. Lapan, Gysbers, and Sun (1997) conducted a study in Missouri with over 22,000 students. These

researchers found that students who attended schools with school counseling programs that were more fully implemented rated their school climate, sense of safety, and learning environment much higher than students in schools that did not have a fully implemented school counseling program. Lapan, Gysbers, and Petroski (2001) conducted a study similar to Lapan et al. (1997); however, the subjects in this case were seventh-grade students. Lapan et al. (2001) found that students who attended schools with fully implemented school counseling programs had better relationships with teachers, higher grades, and higher satisfaction with the quality of the education they were receiving than students who attended a school without a fully implemented counseling program.

Research was conducted to study the overall effectiveness of school counseling. Borders and Drury (1992) concluded that school counseling interventions have a pronounced impact on students' educational and personal development. Whiston and Sexton (1998) concluded that the broad range of tasks and activities that school counselors perform result in a positive change for students. Another study by Whiston and Quinby (2009) found quantitative evidence regarding the overall effectiveness of school counselors. The results indicated that students who received counseling interventions were almost a third of a standard deviation above the students who did not receive the interventions in various measures. A study conducted by Schlossberg, Morris, and Lieberman (2001) found that counselor-led guidance lessons presented to ninth-grade students had the potential to improve students' behavior and attitudes and at the same time addressed students' developmental needs (Whiston & Quinby, 2009).

Sink, Akos, Turnbull, and Mvududu (2008) conducted a study in Washington State middle schools comparing student achievement between schools with

comprehensive school counseling programs (CSCPs) and schools without. The data from the study indicated that just a slight introduction of a CSCP does not necessarily mean higher student achievement. However, there is evidence that the longevity and quality of a CSCP implementation do foster a learning environment that is advantageous to improved student learning. When implementation of a CSCP occurred in the schools researched for five years or more, students in Grades 6 and 7 greatly outperformed their peers academically. This study showed evidence that links long-term CSCPs and the educational development of middle-school students. Therefore, school counselors should educate their school administrators and the school community on the advantages of implementing a successful comprehensive school counseling program (Sink et al., 2008).

Accountability

School counselors have been asked to use accountability practices that demonstrate the effectiveness of comprehensive counseling programs (Housley, McDaniel, & Underwood, 1990; Nims, James, & Hughey, 1998; White, 2007). The ASCA included an accountability system in its national model. The model emphasizes the use of data-driven programs within schools. Accountability can be defined in several ways (Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2010). Stone and Dahir (2007) defined accountability as being able to present documentation of the results of various professional activities. Myrick (2003) defined accountability as being able to account for one's actions in establishing objectives, implementing procedures, and using results for program improvement.

Accountability provides many benefits for school counselors and allows school counselors to define their roles and duties within schools (Isaacs, 2003). It is typically

not mandated that school counselors provide accountability information. Establishing accountability practices allows counseling programs to be aligned with current education reforms, such as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). This Act requires that educators are accountable for all students receiving a high-quality education. The current trend in accountability leads researchers to believe that counselors will be held accountable just as teachers are held to standards of accountability. Disseminating accountability reports allows counselors to be more visible in the field of education and demonstrate their impact on student achievement (Lapan, 2001; Lapan et al., 1997; Napierkowski & Parsons, 1995). Current accountability models typically assess the performance of teachers and students within the schools (Dahir & Stone, 2003; Isaacs, 2003). However, everyone, including school counselors, should be held accountable for student achievement (Stone & Dahir, 2007). Many researchers have claimed that school counselors in general are not interested in following accountability practices (Butler & Bunch, 2005; Johnson-Reid, 2008; Schmidt, 1995). These researchers are reluctant to change accountability practices for counselors into data-driven procedures. This reluctance could be due to lack of time, training, and lack of the requirement for accountability. Accountability practices can help administrators understand the importance of the roles of school counselors (Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2010).

A national study by Perera-Diltz and Mason (2010) explored the accountability practices of 1,704 school counselors in K-12. The first question examined if counselors acquired data relating to the effectiveness and efficiency of their programs. If the response was *yes*, then they were asked how the information was gathered. The second

question examined if the counselors distributed information relating to the effectiveness and efficiency of their program. If the response was *yes*, then they were asked what type of information was distributed and how they distributed the information. The results suggested that 54% of counselors engaged in data-gathering practices and 32% engaged in distributing information. Perera-Diltz and Mason suggested that many counselors do not demonstrate their effectiveness. If counselors cannot demonstrate their effectiveness, many school counseling programs could be diminished in the budget crisis. Also, counselors may be given other administrative tasks (Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2010).

Many stakeholders have vested interests in the successfulness and effectiveness of the school counseling program (Loesch & Ritchie, 2005). Counselors do not get to choose these stakeholders, but they can have different interests. Stakeholders of the counseling program may include parents, principals, teachers, staff, school board members, community members, business and industry, news media, state and local governments, students, and self. Stakeholders' interests are important aspects of the school counseling program. However, some of these stakeholders should be involved in the critical elements of the school counseling program; others should be provided with data related to their purposes and needs relating to student achievement. Stakeholders are increasingly putting pressure on educators to become accountable. With so many stakeholders having a vested interest in the counseling programs, the perceptions of the roles vary. Therefore, it is important for counselors to provide evidence of accountability (White, 2007).

Mission, Elements, Analyze, Stakeholders, Unite, Reanalyze, and Educate (M.E.A.S.U.R.E.) is a seven-step process that helps school counselors to develop a data

driven counseling program in order to connect their programs to student achievement. M.E.A.S.U.R.E. is an acronym that stands for Mission, Elements, Analyze, Stakeholders, Unite, Reanalyze, and Educate. When counselors focus their efforts on school improvement, educational opportunities for students broaden. Therefore, counselors can positively demonstrate their impact on student learning (Dahir & Stone, 2003).

Accountability is about appropriate individuals working together to remove barriers that keep students from learning. When everyone, including counselors, work together to close the achievement gap, the goal of school improvement can be attained (Dahir & Stone, 2003). Measurable success can be demonstrated by documenting an increased number of students completing school with the proper academic preparation, career awareness, and the personal and social growth needed to be successful after high school (Education Trust, 1997).

School Counselors as Leaders

Defining leadership is a very difficult task, and researchers and professionals have struggled to define this term. Leadership has traditionally been within school administration because of the hierarchies in a common school. Within this structure, counselors have not envisioned themselves nor advocated themselves as leaders. Many leadership researchers have found that counselors have many of the skills that it takes to be a leader (Mason & McMahon, 2009). Dollarhide (2003) described counselors as structural and human resource leaders when analyzing the four contexts of leadership—structural (designing effective organizational structures), human resource (believing and empowering others) political (connecting with and collaborating with existing power structures), and symbolic (developing and communicating a vision) (Bolman & Deal,

1997). A theory of leadership that aligns with recent reforms in school counseling is transformational leadership. Transformational leadership is designed for power to be shared and the goal of achieving is on-going—not simply about completing tasks.

Amatea and Clark (2005) conducted a study to examine the perceptions of administrators regarding the role of school counselors. Only 12% of the administrators in the study viewed their counselors as a school leader.

Shillingford and Lambie (2010) conducted research on counselors' values, leadership practices, and programmatic service delivery using a structural equation model (SEM) where the research question was as follows: Do school counselors' values and leadership practices contribute significantly to their programmatic service delivery? Three instruments were used in this study: the Schwartz Values Survey (SVS), the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), and the School Counselor Activity Rating Scale (SCARS). The findings of the study indicated that school counselors' leadership practices contributed significantly to programmatic service delivery. Values did not appear to contribute significantly to the service delivery. However, counselors should analyze their own motivational goals. Lastly, counselors should have leadership strategies with the goal of improving student outcomes (Shillingford & Lambie, 2010).

The Leadership Practices Inventory Self-Instrument (LPI) was used in Mason and McMahon's (2009) study to understand the leadership practices of school counselors. The results suggested that the school counselors with more experience and longer terms in their schools scored higher on the leadership practices instrument than the younger, less experienced counselors. This study suggested that school counselor preparation programs should analyze the extent to which the curriculum focuses on developing

leadership skills. The programs should also look at what is practiced in the graduate programs translates to leadership practices on the job (Mason & McMahon, 2009).

The Impact of the Economy on Counseling Programs

The economic crisis has adversely affected many schools across the nation (Griffin & Farris, 2010). Thirty-six states proposed major cuts in education due to the economic crisis (Johnson, Koulis, & Oliff, 2009). The state of California expected \$3.9 billion cuts to K-12 education (Rau & Harper, 2009), Florida cut the expenditures to local school districts to \$140 per student, and Colorado decided to cut several educational programs and reduce funding to almost 4% (Johnson et al., 2009). Some school districts have chosen to reduce teaching and school counseling staff in order to reduce the budget. The Hartford, CT school district decided to cut 10 school counseling positions and also eliminate other services. The Department of Education estimated that anywhere from 635,000 to 1.1 million students will lose access to learning opportunities (Dorgan, 2008).

Many times schools in rural areas do not have the resources to create a complete school counseling program. Research shows that this problem is not uncommon (Sink & Yillik-Downer, 2001). The counselors in these situations reported that they are regularly assigned to non-guidance roles such as clerical and discipline duties. These counselors are usually willing to engage in these non-counseling duties (Gysbers & Henderson, 2000). Nonguidance activities can be divided into four categories: supervisory duties, clerical duties, special education programs and services, and administrative duties (ASCA, 2003).

The ASCA Model

The ASCA began work on the ASCA National Model in 2001; it was released in 2003 and revised in 2005. The ASCA outlined the basis of how the work of school counselors is tied to student achievement. The success of the ASCA National Model depends on the school counselors' willingness to learn new skills and change traditional practices. These counselors would have to evaluate current programs and use data to prove effectiveness (Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008).

Burnham and Jackson (2000) studied the level of participation of counselors in various functions. Results indicated that counselors were consistently meeting the needs of students. However, the results indicated a need for counselors to move toward current models for school counseling programs and a closer alignment of counseling programs with the ASCA model. Several non-counseling duties also were identified, such as requesting and receiving records, scheduling students, enrolling students, and recordkeeping. Being assigned non-counseling duties can produce role confusion of school counselors. Burnham and Jackson (2000) suggested that the non-counseling duties be reassigned to the appropriate individuals.

Greene's 2004 study regarding how counseling duties affect student achievement revealed cases where counselors were unable to focus on student-centered activities because of the demands that were put on them for non-guidance activities. In this study it was also found that counselors in lower performing schools felt as if testing (a non-counseling duty) was the most important task. However, counselors in higher-performing districts found that individual counseling was the most important task in relation to student achievement (Greene, 2004).

A study was conducted by Dahir, Burnham, and Stone (2009) in the state of Alabama (one of the first states to adopt the ASCA National Model) to measure the readiness and/or progress toward implementing a comprehensive school counseling program. The attitudes, beliefs, and priorities of school counselors regarding the counseling attributes of successful delivery of a school counseling program were identified. The results of the study had several implications. The counselors at all levels seemed to have similar priorities and beliefs regarding their roles and the impact on the school counseling program. The survey indicated that middle-school counselors were more strongly involved than other levels regarding student-related tasks. The middle-school counselors also had higher scores on the survey in the area of personal-social development related services. High school counselors had higher means in the academic development area. Elementary counselors had higher scores in the area of program management. Overall, the study demonstrated that middle-school counselors followed by elementary counselors demonstrated tasks that were more aligned with the state plan and the ASCA National Model (Dahir et al., 2009).

Hatch and Chen-Hayes (2008) conducted a study to assess the validity and reliability of an instrument that could be used to assess school counselor beliefs regarding the important aspects of different school counseling program components. The instrument was used in a nationwide sample of school counselors. Another purpose of the study was to compile data on the beliefs of school counseling program components that are related to the ASCA model. If one can understand historical perspectives, then researchers can have important information for evaluating the current and future impact of the ASCA model (Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008).

The sample of Hatch and Chen-Hayes' (2008) study included 3,000 ASCA members who were currently serving as school counselors and directors of counseling. The School Counseling Program Component Scale (SCPCS) was the instrument used in the study. The results indicated that the counselors in the study reported that activities such as use of data for program planning and accountability were less important than mission, goals, competencies, and administrator support. The results of the study could be attributed to the lack of training on how to collect, analyze, and interpret data. Counselors also may fear that the data will not do anything to reduce the non-school counseling tasks. Future research may need to be conducted to determine if counselors who use data conduct less non-counseling duties than counselors who do not use data. Lastly, the SCPCS can be an excellent tool to monitor the progress of national and state school counseling models (Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008).

Not all states are aligned with the state and national counseling models. It is important to analyze school counseling programs to see if they are aligned with state and national standards. Martin, Carey, and DeCoster (2009) conducted a national survey in 2008 to examine the status of school counseling models in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The results determined that 17 states have models that are established, 24 states are working toward implementing a model, and 10 states are at the beginning stages of model development. Forty-four states have written models. However, having a model and actually implementing a model are two different things. A similar study was done in 1998 and only 24 states had written models. These results indicate that initiatives formulated through the Education Trust and the ASCA model have greatly influenced states into implementing statewide counseling models (Martin et al., 2009).

Leader-Member Exchange Theory

The relationship between the principal and counselor can very much influence their roles according to the LMX theory (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Therefore, it is important to explore the relationships of supervisors and subordinates. Beehr et al. (2006) examined the similarity between supervisors and subordinates relating to supervisors' satisfaction with subordinates. Beehr et al. investigated whether the supervisor likes the subordinate as a person versus whether the supervisor appreciates having him or her as a subordinate. This study explored "liking" an individual as a person and being "satisfied" with their job performance. The results of the study suggested that satisfaction and liking were related so strongly that they could actually be the same thing. As stated in the LMX theory, liking can cause satisfaction and satisfaction can cause the liking of subordinates (Beehr et al., 2006).

Another study conducted by Beehr et al. (2006) examined the functional relationships of subordinates and supervisors. Functional relationships referred to tasks that the subordinate performs for the supervisor in order for the supervisor to reach goals. The findings of the study indicated that functional relationships are very important to supervisors and are related to positive job performance. What the subordinate does for the supervisor is more important than who the person is or the entity relationship. (Beehr et al., 2006). Principals often assign counselors administrative tasks in order for both the principal and school counselor to reach goals (Beehr et al., 2006).

The LMX theory has been used to increase the quality of the supervisor-employee relationship and job satisfaction. In a study by Stringer (2006) surveys were given to 57 firefighters employed with a fire department. The results of the study indicated that high-

quality supervisor-employee relationships are positively correlated with employee job satisfaction. Stringer asserted that supervisors can add value to their organization by embracing leadership-building with all employees (2006). Principals can add to the job satisfaction of counselors by providing support to them as they try to implement the roles of school counselors as aligned in the ASCA model.

According to Paisley and Mahon (2001), role confusion is a challenge facing school counselors. The school counseling profession has been inconsistent in the ways that it has described who counselors are and what they do. This inconsistency confuses principals, teachers, and parents (Sears & Granello, 2002). A 2009 study by Clemens, Milson, and Cashwell used the LMX theory to examine principal and school counselor relationships. Several instruments were used in this study to determine whether the quality of the principal-counselor relationship affected the role definition of counselors and other variables. A total of 188 school counselors from three southeastern states participated in the study. The results indicated that the stronger the relationship with the principal and counselor, the greater the consistency between how the counselors were implementing programs and what they considered to be ideal elements of counseling programs (Clemens et al., 2009).

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy has been demonstrated to be an important aspect of many areas of life including teaching, counseling, and dealing with change (Bandura, 1997; Larson & Daniels, 1998). According to Bandura's social cognitive theory, self-efficacy is an important element in how well individuals succeed in their careers. Self-efficacy deals with one's perception of his or her own ability to achieve a given task (Bandura, 1997).

Several books and literature reviews have been written that describe studies based on the self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1969, 1973, 1982, 1986).

Betz and Hackett (1981) conducted studies on women's self-efficacy beliefs and their math abilities and how it predicted their avoidance of careers that involved math and natural sciences. Betz (1992) identified four sources of efficacy information (i.e., performance accomplishments, vicarious learning, emotional arousal, and verbal persuasion). Lenox and Subich (1994) extended research that was previously conducted and tested Bandura's concepts. Lenox and Subich (1994) found that there is a relationship that exists between interest and self-efficacy. McAuliffe (1992) suggested that individuals with low self-efficacy limit themselves in their career aspirations.

A recent national study was conducted with members of the ASCA (2006). The information included in the study was level of school counselors' self-efficacy, type of program, status of achievement gap, and equity in their schools. The results indicated that school counselors with higher self-efficacy were more aware of achievement gap data. Also, counselors with high self-efficacy who indicated a program approach were likely to report that the achievement gaps were narrowing. One fifth of the counselors in the study reported that there was no awareness of achievement gap data (Bodenhorn, Wolfe, & Airen, 2010). This study indicated how self-efficacy plays an important role in developing a successful school counseling program. Bodenhorn et al. (2010) also demonstrated how counselors can affect student achievement by removing the barriers that impede student learning.

Larson and Daniels (1998) conducted an extensive review of 32 self-efficacy studies regarding school counseling between 1983 and 1998. The researchers found that

counseling self-efficacy is the major factor in effective counseling action. The studies support a positive relationship between counseling self-efficacy and outcome expectations. The studies indicated some relationship between counseling self-efficacy and counselor characteristics, such as self-reflection and level of training. Researchers have also found higher levels of self-efficacy in more experienced counselors than less experienced counselors (Larson & Daniels, 1998; Lent, Hill, & Hoffman, 2003).

Many school counselors receive little supervision after their training. There is a significant relationship between supervisors' perceptions and counselors' performance and counselor self-efficacy (Larson & Daniels, 1998; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997). If positive feedback is given to school counselors, counseling self-efficacy can be increased (Daniels & Larson, 2001). A study conducted by Daniels and Larson (2001) indicated that counseling self-efficacy can be increased if supervisors acknowledge the mastery of the counselor's performance. School counselors may have decreased self-efficacy due to the lack of feedback regarding his or her efforts.

Summary

The ASCA model along with its standards served as one of the theoretical bases of this study. This model is a tool that is used by counselors as a guide to implement the roles of school counselors (ASCA, 2006). The LMX theory and self-efficacy were also used as a theoretical basis in this study. The LMX Theory deals with the differences in the quality of relationships between principals and counselors (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Self-efficacy is described in the aspect of how role confusion can cause low self-efficacy (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). In order to explain the background of school counseling, a brief history was given. Pertinent research literature and professional perspectives of the

perceptions of administrators, school counselors, and teachers relating to the ASCA model then were discussed. Research has shown that these individuals have differences in the way they view the roles of school counselors. Research studies in this chapter revealed that school counselors can act as leaders and promote student achievement and use accountability practices to demonstrate effectiveness of school counseling programs. Lastly, the effect that the economy has on school counselors was discussed.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research method design used for this study on the roles of school counselors. Research questions and hypotheses are outlined. The rationale for the method of selecting the school counselors and principals as the research population is explained. The contents of Chapter III consist of the participants, research design, procedures, and analysis of data. The chapter then describes the instrument that was used to collect data in the study. The independent and dependent variables were explained along with the statistical processes that were used to analyze data.

Research Design

The research design for this study regarding the roles of school counselors was non-experimental and employed quantitative analyses. Data were gathered from a questionnaire completed by middle grades and high school counselors and principals. The questionnaire focused on activities assigned to counselors that are outlined in the ASCA model, which are proposed as effective ways to support students. The areas of focus included counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination. The questionnaire also included non-counseling activities that are not aligned with the ASCA model.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study investigated whether the perceptions between principals and counselors differ regarding the roles of school counselors. School counselors provide services to students, parents, staff, and the community through a school guidance curriculum, individual student planning, and responsive services. Responsive services are those services that address the immediate concerns of students, such as stress, family

issues, truancy, tardiness, substance abuse, and grief. The ASCA model promotes the school counselor's mission to develop students through academic, career, and personal/social growth (American School Counselor Association [ASCA], 2006). Based on the literature, the following research questions were proposed:

1. Is there a difference between school counselor and principal perceptions about the roles of school counselors?
2. Are counselor and principal perceptions related to the independent variable of counselor-student ratio, grade level(s) of school, number of faculty members, location of school district, performance level of the school, years of experience as a counselor or principal, and economic condition of school district?
3. Is there a difference between how often counselors perform tasks and the severity of budget cuts?
4. Is there a difference between the roles of school counselors as defined by the ASCA and the roles that are actually performed by counselors?
5. Is there a difference in perceptions between middle grades and high school counselors and principals regarding the roles of school counselors?

The hypotheses related to the research questions were as follows:

H₁: There is a difference between school counselor and principal perceptions about the roles of school counselors.

H₂: Counselor and principal perceptions are related to the independent variables of counselor-student ratio, grade level(s) of school, number of faculty members, location of school district, performance level of the school, years of experience as a counselor or principal, and economic condition of school district.

H₃: There is a difference between how often counselors perform tasks and the severity of budget cuts.

H₄: There is a difference between the roles of school counselors as defined by ASCA and the roles that are actually performed by counselors.

H₅: There is a difference in perceptions between middle grades and high school counselors and principals regarding the roles of school counselors.

Participants in the Study

Secondary counselors and principals were asked to analyze the roles of school counselors. The target study sample included 190 counselors and 272 principals from 101 schools in 50 school districts from various areas of the state of Mississippi. Of those to whom instruments were sent, 53 counselors and 66 principals responded. This represented a return rate of 28% for counselors and 24% for principals. Because of the distinctions that the ASCA model draws among counseling tasks at the various educational levels, secondary counselors of middle grades and high schools were chosen. Counselors of elementary schools are often assigned tasks with very different roles due to the nature of their students. Also, many elementary schools are not assigned fulltime counselors. The study participants offered a representative sample of secondary counselors and principals in the state of Mississippi by making sure counselors and principals used in the study were from various areas and schools in the state of Mississippi. Therefore, the population was geographically representative of all areas of the state.

A pilot test was administered to 20 participants prior to the study in order to determine reliability of the study instrument. The data from the responses of pilot test

participants were analyzed using the statistical program SPSS. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient test was used to determine reliability for each subscale. The test disclosed a reliability of greater than 0.70 for all subscales, with the exception of two, which produced reliability results of .68 and .61. Because these Cronbach's alpha tests were only slightly below the 0.70 level, the questions were retained in the model. The two subscales addressed perceptions of what counselors should do in the areas of Consultation and Other Activities as shown in Table 1. Validity of the School Counselor Activity Rating Scale (SCARS) was established by its original author; the validation process and results are explained in "The School Counselor Activity Rating Scale: An Instrument For Gathering Process Data" (Scarborough, 2005).

Table 1

Cronbach's Alpha for Pilot Study

Cronbach's Alpha	Subscale
.76	Economic Factors
.89	Counseling Activities Should Do
.92	Counseling Activities Actually Do
.68	Consultation Activities Should Do

Instrumentation

The SCARS instrument was developed by Scarborough (2005) as a way to gather and process data regarding how counselors actually spend their time versus how they

Table 1 (continued)

Cronbach's Alpha	Subscale
.79	Consultation Activities Actually Do
.93	Curriculum Activities Should Do
.87	Curriculum Activities Actually Do
.72	Coordination Activities Should Do
.82	Coordination Activities Actually Do
.81	Other Activities Should Do
.61	Other Activities Actually Do

would prefer to spend their time. The instrument was revised for the current study to assess whether school counselors and principals agreed with the stated roles and whether the counselors were actually performing the specific roles that are listed. Permission to revise and use the instrument was provided by the author (Appendix B).

The instrument contains 48 items divided into five subscales of counselor roles: Counseling Activities, Consultation Activities, Curriculum Activities, Coordination Activities, and Other Activities. The instrument also contains demographic items and items related to the economic condition of the school district in which the participant is employed. After Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was obtained (Appendix C), the questionnaire was given to middle and high school principals and counselors in

various school districts in the state of Mississippi, and the responses were analyzed using quantitative measures.

The instrument consists of 48 quantitative items related to the literature on the roles of school counselors. It addresses the four domains of counseling that are outlined in the ASCA model. The eight demographic items for the individual and school include grade level(s) of school, number of students, number of counselors, number of faculty members, location of school, years of experience as a counselor or principal, performance level of the school, and job title of participant. The instrument also includes eight quantitative items that address the economic condition of school districts as addressed in the literature.

Comparing the responses to items 1-48 of columns A and B of Part III-Activities supported Research Questions 1, 4, and 5. Information was gathered from roles outlined in the ASCA model. Research Question 2 was supported by responses to items 1-8 in Part I-Demographics of the instrument. Research Question 3 was supported by the responses to items 1-8 in Part II-Economic Factors of the instrument. Part III of the instrument was divided into four subscales that describe the four areas of counseling and one subscale that describes other activities that are considered non-counseling duties as outlined in the ASCA model. Each scale has the following headings:

- Counseling Activities,
- Consultation Activities,
- Curriculum Activities,
- Coordination Activities, and
- “Other Activities.”

The ASCA created the ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs in order to help define what counselors do and how students are different because of what school counselors do. The purpose of the model is to provide counselors with a tool to implement a school counseling program that becomes a part of the academic mission of the school, ensures that all students have equitable access to the school counseling program, identifies and delivers the knowledge and skills that students can acquire, and ensures that the school counseling program is comprehensive and delivered to all students. The ASCA model serves as a framework to guide states, districts, and schools with the tools necessary to develop, implement, and evaluate a complete school counseling program (ASCA National Model, 2003). The ASCA model provides an outline for a programmatic delivery of services. The practices include counseling, consulting, collaboration, and curriculum delivery (Shillingford & Lambie, 2010). These services constituted the focus in this study.

Many researchers have provided school counseling literature regarding comprehensive, developmental counseling programs and their positive impact (Foster, Young, & Hermann, 2005; Galassi, Griffin, & Akos, 2008; Perusse, Goodnough, Donegan, & Jones, 2004; Poynton, Schumach & Wilczenski, 2008; Schwallie-Giddis, ter Maat, & Pak, 2003; Walsh, Barrett, & DePaul, 2007). The ASCA model is based on research regarding the impact of a successful comprehensive school counseling program.

The items for Part I consist of eight demographic questions. The options for position in district include the following job classifications: guidance counselor, assistant principal, and principal. The options for number of counselors are 1-8. For the number of students there are 14 groups each with a range of 200 students. The groups are listed

as follows: <100, 100-299, 300-499, 500-699, 700-899, 900-1,099, 100-1,299, 1,300-1,499, 1,500-1,699, 1,700-1,899, 1,900-2,099, 2,100-2,299, 2,300-2,500, >2,500. The options for grade level(s) of school are 5-12. For the number of faculty members, there are 13 groups with ranges of 25. The groups are <25, 25-49, 50-74, 75-99, 100-124, 125-149, 150-174, 175-199, 200-224, 225-249, 250-274, 275-299, <300. The options for location of district are north Mississippi (areas north of Jackson, MS), central Mississippi (areas north of Hattiesburg, MS, but south of Jackson, MS), and south Mississippi (areas south of Hattiesburg, MS). The option for years of experience are >5, 5-10, 10-15, 20-25, and 25+. The options for performance level are Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At Risk of Failing, and Failing.

Part II consists of eight items related to the economic condition of the school district. Item number 1 gives the following options regarding the impact of the budget on the school district: none, minimally, moderately, and severely. The item regarding free/reduced lunch is addressed by giving four options stated as a percentage in 25% increments. Items 3-8 in the instrument use a 4-point Likert-type scale to address the questions regarding the budget. Items 3-8 in Part II are scaled from 1 (*Agree*) to 4 (*Strongly disagree*). The items in column A in Part III are scaled from 1 (*Agree*) to 4 (*Strongly disagree*). The items in column B in Part III are scaled from 1 (*Not at all*) to 4 (*Very often*).

The items in Part III are divided into subscales under the following categorical constructs: Counseling, Consultation, Curriculum, Coordination, and Other Activities. Items 1-10 address the subscale of Counseling, while items 11-17 address the subscale of Consultation. Items 18-25 describe the subscale of Curriculum, and items 26-38 are

associated with the subscale of Coordination. Lastly, items 39-48 address the subscale of “Other Activities” that are not aligned with the ASCA model. The 48 items in this section are divided into two parts. Each part is constructed using a 4-point Likert-type rating scale of strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree.

Data Collection Process

A permission letter was attached to the instrument for review by the individuals whose participation in the study was requested. The letter advised recipients of the voluntary nature of participating and it assured them that there were no negative consequences if the participant chose not to participate. The participants were informed that filling out the questionnaire indicated that they had agreed to participate in the research study.

The questionnaires were distributed to participants by mail. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was included for them to use in returning the questionnaire. The participant was asked to seal the envelope and mail it to the address on the envelope. Participants were given two weeks to respond to the survey and there were 119 respondents.

Variables in the Study

The dependent variable for the study is the perceptions of the counselors and principals of school districts. The independent variables in the study were counselor-student ratio, grade level(s) of school, number of faculty members, location of school district, years of experience as a counselor or principal, performance level, and economic condition of school district. These variables are based on the literature that addresses

how the economic condition of a school district can determine the number of counselors and the nature of their roles in secondary schools.

The reliability and internal consistency of the variables were explored further during the actual study using Cronbach's Alpha. A Cronbach's alpha test of coefficient reliability was performed on each set of items to determine how well each set of items measured a single construct. A Cronbach's alpha of 0.70 or greater is considered acceptable. The Cronbach's alpha test for each subscale yielded a reliability of greater than 0.70 with the exception of the Other Activities section. These results are profiled in Table 2. The Other Activities section under part b provided a Cronbach's alpha of .51. However, this section was kept due to the Other Activities section entailing a wide variety of non-counseling duties.

Table 2

Cronbach's Alpha for Final Study

Cronbach's Alpha	Subscale
<hr/>	
.77	Economic Factors
.86	Counseling Activities Should Do
.91	Counseling Activities Actually Do

Analysis of Data

For this quantitative study, the responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics, multiple linear regression, ANOVA, MANOVA, and Paired t-tests.

Table 2 (continued)

Cronbach's Alpha	Subscale
.81	Consultation Activities Should Do
.82	Consultation Activities Actually Do
.96	Curriculum Activities Should Do
.94	Curriculum Activities Actually Do
.87	Coordination Activities Should Do
.89	Coordination Activities Actually Do
.74	Other Activities Should Do

Descriptive statistics of minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation were used to produce descriptive statistics for the demographic items, items 1-8 of the economic factors section, and items 1-48 of the activities section which includes the subscales of Counseling, Consultation, Curriculum, Coordination, and Other Activities. A MANOVA was used in the examination of the data for Hypothesis 1, which deals with the difference between the counselors' and principals' perceptions of what counselors should be doing and what they are actually doing. Hypothesis 5 also used a MANOVA in order to determine if there was a difference in perceptions between middle grades and high school counselors and principals regarding the roles of school counselors. A multiple linear regression was used for Hypothesis 2 to determine if counselor and principal perceptions were related to the independent variables of counselor-student ratio, grade level(s) of

school, number of faculty members, location of school district, performance level of the school, years of experience as a counselor or principal, and economic condition of school district. An ANOVA was used for Hypothesis 3 to determine if there were differences between how often counselors perform tasks and the severity of budget cuts. Paired t-tests were used to test Hypothesis 4 to examine the differences between the roles of school counselors as defined by the ASCA and the roles that counselors actually perform. A significance test was conducted to determine whether or not to accept or reject the null hypotheses; the value was set at $p = .05$.

Value codes were created for years of experience, number of students, and number of faculty members. For years of experience, six groups were created with a span of five years in each group, ranging from 0 to 25 or more years. The value codes were assigned for years of experience as follows: $<5=1$, $5-10=2$, $10-15=3$, $15-20=4$, $20-25=5$, $25+=6$. For number of students, 14 groups were created within the span of 100 or less to 2,500. There was one grouping of 100 or less and 13 groups with graduated increments of 200 in each group, ranging from 100 to 2,500 or more. The value codes for number of students were assigned as follows: $<100=1$, $100-299=2$, $300-499=3$, $500-699=4$, $700-899=5$, $900-1,099=6$, $1,100-1,299=7$, $1,300-1,499=8$, $1,500-1,699=9$, $1,700-1,899=10$, $1,900-2,099=11$, $2,100-2,299=12$, $2,300-2,500=13$, $>2,500=14$. For number of faculty members, 13 groups were created with a span of 25 faculty members. The groups ranged from less than 25 faculty members to 300 or more. Value codes were assigned to number of faculty members as follows: $<25=1$, $25-49=2$, $50-74=3$, $75-99=4$, $100-124=5$, $125-149=6$, $150-174=7$, $175-199=8$, $200-224=9$, $225-249=10$, $250-274=11$, $275-299=12$, $<300=13$. Value codes were assigned to the variable of position in school district as

follows: Guidance Counselor=1, Assistant Principal=2, and Principal=3. Value codes were also assigned to the variable of location of school as follows: North Mississippi=1, Central Mississippi=2, and South Mississippi=3. Similarly, value codes were assigned to the variable of school performance level as follows: Star=1, High Performing=2, Successful=3, Academic Watch =4, Low Performing=5, At Risk of Failing=6, and Failing=7. Value codes were assigned for the severity of budget cuts in the last school year as follows: None=1, Minimally=2, Moderately=3, and Severely=4. Finally, value codes were assigned for the free/reduced lunch percentage as follows: <25%=1, 26%-50%=2, 51%-74% =3, and 75%-100%=4. Means for the subscales of Counseling, Coordination, Consultation, Curriculum, and Other Activities were calculated for use in the analyses related to the research questions and hypotheses. The data from the questionnaires were analyzed using the Predictive Analytic Software Statistics (PASW) SPSS program.

Summary

Chapter III described the design and methodology for this study. It profiled how the ASCA model, along with its standards, was used for the development of the instrument that was used. The questionnaire was developed to determine the alignment between the roles of school counselors and those defined in the ASCA model, the differences in perceptions between principals and counselors regarding the roles of school counselors, and the impact of the economy on the perceptions of counselors and principals. The areas of focus included counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination. The questionnaire also included non-counseling activities that are not aligned with the ASCA model. Participants in this study consisted of 119 secondary

counselors and principals across the state of Mississippi. The data from questionnaires were analyzed using descriptive statistics and statistical analyses of ANOVA, MANOVA, multiple linear regression, and paired t-tests.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The roles of professional school counselors have changed significantly over this century. Due to the pressures of high-stakes testing and budget cuts, counselors often are tasked with roles that are not aligned with state or national standards for school counseling programs (Brown, Galassi, & Akos 2004; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). The purpose of this study was to analyze the differences in perceptions between principals and school counselors regarding the roles of school counselors and ascertain if the economy has affected these perceptions. The study further examined the impact of the economic downturn upon perceptions about these roles. Finally, this study sought to determine if the roles assumed by school counselors are aligned with the ASCA model.

The research design for this study regarding the roles of school counselors was non-experimental and employed quantitative analyses. Data were gathered from questionnaires completed by middle grades and high school counselors and principals. The questionnaire focused on activities assigned to counselors that are outlined in the ASCA model, which are proposed as effective ways to perform professional duties and support students. The areas of focus include Counseling, Consultation, Curriculum, and Coordination. The questionnaire also includes non-counseling activities that are not prescribed in the ASCA model.

Descriptive statistics and MANOVA were used to analyze the differences in perceptions between school counselor and principal perceptions about the roles of school counselors in Hypothesis 1. This study used a multiple linear regression analysis to determine the relationships between the dependent variable, the perceptions of the

counselors and principals regarding the roles of school counselors, and seven independent variables in Hypothesis 2. The independent variables included counselor-student ratio, grade level(s) of school, number of faculty members, location of school district, years of experience as a counselor or principal, performance level of school, and economic condition of school district. An ANOVA and descriptive statistics were used to determine if there were difference between the severity of budget cuts and how often counselors completed tasks in Hypothesis 3. For Hypothesis 4, descriptive statistics and paired t-tests were used to determine if there was a difference in the school counselor roles that are actually performed by counselors and what is defined by ASCA. Descriptive statistics and MANOVA were used to determine if there is a difference in perception between middle grades and high school counselors in Hypothesis 5. This chapter describes the results and statistical findings of the study.

Results of Descriptive Analyses Related to Demographics and Research Questions

Demographic Items

Descriptive statistics were used to describe the responses from the demographic items for school counselors and principals. A frequency table was generated for all items. The following demographic information was obtained from the data: for the demographic item addressing professional position, 119 responses were received. Of those responding, 53 participants (44.5%) were guidance counselors, 43 (36.1%) were assistant principals, and 23 (19.3%) were principals. Table 3 provides the frequencies and percentages for this item.

Table 3

Frequencies of Professional Positions

Position	Frequency	Percent
Guidance Counselor	53	44.5
Assistant Principal	43	36.1
Principal	23	19.3
Total	119	100.0

The 53 counselor respondents reported a wide range of counseling experience. Out of 53 respondents, 22 (41.5%) reported 5-10 years of experience, 10 (18.9%) reported 15-20 years of experience, 9 (16.9%) reported that they had less than 5 years of experience as a counselor, 7 (13.2%) reported 10-15 years of experience, and there were very low numbers in the other experience ranges. The demographic frequencies and percentages can be found in Table 4.

Table 4

Frequencies of Experience Levels of Counselors

Years of Experience	Frequency	Percent
<5	9	16.9
5-10	22	41.5

Table 4 (continued)

Years of Experience	Frequency	Percent
10-15	7	13.2
15-20	10	18.9
20-25	3	5.7
25+	2	3.8
Total	53	100.0

Out of 66 principals who reported years of experience as a principal, 24 (36.4%) reported that they had less than 5 years of experience as a principal, 22 (33.3%) reported 5-10 years of experience, 9 (13.6%) reported 10-15 years of experience, and there were very low numbers in the other years of experience ranges. The demographic frequencies and percentages can be found in Table 5.

Table 5

Frequencies of Experience Levels of Principals

Years of Experience	Frequency	Percent
<5	24	36.4
5-10	22	33.3

Table 5 (continued)

Years of Experience	Frequency	Percent
10-15	9	13.6
15-20	4	6.1
20-25	3	4.5
25+	4	6.1
Total	66	100.0

Out of 119 total respondents, 43 (36.1%) reported that there were 3 counselors in their schools, 35 (29.4%) reported having two counselors, 22 (18.5) reported having one counselor, 16 (13.4%) reported having four counselors, and the other response options produced very low numbers. The frequencies and percentages are listed in Table 6.

Table 6

Frequencies of Counselors in Participants' Schools

Number of Counselors	Frequency	Percent
1	22	18.5
2	35	29.5

Table 6 (continued)

Number of Counselors	Frequency	Percent
3	43	36.1
4	16	13.4
5	2	1.7
6	1	.8
Total	119	100.0

There were 118 respondents who reported a wide range for number of students in their schools. There were 27 (22.7%) respondents who reported 700-899 students, 22 (18.5%) who reported 500-699 students, 20 (16.8%) who reported 1100-1299 students, 16 (13.4%) who reported 1300-1499 students, 12 (10.1%) who reported 1500-1699 students, and the numbers of students reported in other ranges were very low. The frequencies and percentages are listed in Table 7.

Table 7

Frequencies of Students in Participants' Schools

Number of Students	Frequency	Percent
100-299	4	3.4

Table 7 (continued)

Number of Students	Frequency	Percent
300-499	9	7.6
500-699	22	18.5
700-899	27	22.7
900-1099	8	6.7
1100-1299	20	16.8
1300-1499	16	13.4
1500-1699	12	10.1
Not Reported	1	.8
Total	118	100.0

For the purposes of this study, middle grades were considered grades 5-8 and high school was considered as 9th-12th grade. As shown in Table 8, 32% of respondents reported having grades 5-8 at the school in which they worked. There were 67.9% who reported that their schools contained grades 9-12. The frequencies and percentages are provided in Table 8.

Table 8

Frequencies of Grade Levels in Participants' Schools

Grade Levels	Frequency	Percent
5	6	1.4
6	38	8.6
7	49	11.0
8	49	11.0
9	73	16.4
10	77	17.3
11	76	17.1
12	76	17.1

There were 118 individuals who responded to the item regarding the number of faculty members. Out of 118 respondents, 38 (31.9%) reported 50-74 faculty members, 30 (25.2%) reported 75-99 faculty members, 25 (21.0%) reported 100-124 faculty members, 20 (16.8%) reported 25-49 faculty members, and the other numbers reported in the other ranges were very low. The frequencies and percentages are provided in Table 9.

Table 9

Frequencies of Faculty Members in Participants' Schools

Number of		
Faculty		
Members	Frequency	Percent
<hr/>		
<25	3	2.5
25-49	20	16.8
50-74	38	31.9
75-99	30	25.2
100-124	25	21.0
125-149	1	.8
175-199	1	.8
Not Reported	1	.8
Total	119	100.0

Among the participants, 119 responded to the item that addressed school location. As shown in Table 10, 47 (39.5%) of the schools in which respondents worked were in Central Mississippi, 43 (36.1%) were in South Mississippi, and 28 (23.5%) were in North Mississippi.

Table 10

Frequencies of Location of Participants' Schools

Location	Frequency	Percent
North MS	28	23.5
Central MS	47	39.5
South MS	43	36.1
Not reported	1	.8
Total	118	100.0

Among the participants, 118 answered the item concerning performance level of schools. Of these, 35 (9.7%) reported that their schools were Star schools (the state's highest performance rating), 46 (38.7%) reported that their schools were High Performing schools (the state's second highest rating), and 28 (23.7%) reported that their schools were Successful schools (the state's third highest rating). There were very few respondents who reported in the other performance levels. Results are shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Frequencies of Performance Level in Participants' Schools

Performance Level	Frequency	Percent
Star	35	29.4
High Performing	46	38.7
Successful	28	23.5
Academic Watch	2	1.7
Low Performing	5	4.2
At Risk of Failing	1	.8
Failing	1	.8
Total	118	99.2
Not Reported	1	.8
Total	119	100.0

Following the demographics section, the instrument was divided into 6 sections: Economic Condition of District, Counseling Activities, Consultation Activities, Coordination Activities, Curriculum Activities, and Other Activities. Scores from each subscale of the instrument were averaged and used in the model. The descriptive results from these analyses are in the following sections.

Economic Condition Items

The first two items in the Economic Factors section were designed to allow

participants to assess the impact of the budget cuts on the school district and describe the percentage of free/reduced lunch. Item number 1 gives the following options regarding the impact of the budget on the school district: none, minimally, moderately, and severely. Among the participants, 119 answered the item concerning the impact of the budget of the school district. Of these, 54 (45.4%) reported that their school was impacted *moderately*, 52 (43.7%) reported that their school was impacted *minimally*, nine (7.6%) reported that their school was impacted severely, and four (3.3%) reported *none* as the impact of the budget.

The item regarding free/reduced lunch was addressed by giving four options stated as a percentage in 25% increments. Among the participants, 115 answered the item concerning the percentage of free/reduced lunch at their school. Of these, 37 (31.1%) reported 51%-74% as the percentage of free/reduced lunch, 35 (29.4%) reported 26%-50% as the percentage of free/reduced lunch, 23 (19.3%) reported 75%-100% for the percentage of free/reduced lunch, and 20 (16.8%) reported <25% as their free/reduced lunch percentage.

The Economic Factors section also includes a sub-section that addressed how particular economic issues have impacted the school counseling program. For this sub-section, 1 is the lowest rating, and corresponds to the response *strongly disagree*. The value 4 is the highest rating, and corresponds to the response *strongly agree*. The values of 2 and 3 respectively correspond to the responses *disagree* and *agree*. The highest rating was a 2.22 and the lowest rating was a 1.71. This limited range of means suggests that respondents disagree or strongly disagree that the economy has impacted the

counseling program. The overall mean of this subscale was $M=2.05$, as shown in Table 12.

Table 12

Descriptives of Effects of Economic Factors

Economic Factor	N	Mean	SD
Impact on School Counseling Program	119	2.22	.91
Reduction in Number of Counselors	117	1.71	.92
Changes in Roles of School Counselors	119	2.22	.98
Adequacy of Resources	119	2.08	.79
Cuts to Instructional Programs	118	2.38	.75
Participation in Training	118	1.73	.65
Total	119	2.05	.59

Items Related to Perceptions of Counselor Roles

Descriptive statistics were used to provide elements needed in the analyses related to perceptions of counselor roles and were used to answer Research Questions 1 and 5. This section dealt with comparing the perceptions of counselors and principals in regards to what counselors should be doing (Column A) and what they are actually doing (Column B). Scores were averaged into subscale means as follows: scores for questions 1-10, which identified Counseling Activities, were averaged into a subscale mean; scores for questions 11-17, which identified Consultation Activities, were averaged into a

subscale mean; scores for questions 18-25, which identified Curriculum Activities, were averaged into a subscale mean; scores for questions 26-38, which identified Coordination Activities, were averaged into a subscale mean; and, scores for questions 39-48, which identified Other Activities, were averaged into a subscale mean.

The items for activities that counselors should be doing (Column A) are on a 4-point Likert scale with a rating of 1 equating to *strongly disagree* and a rating of 4 equating to *strongly agree*. The items for activities that counselors are actually doing (Column B) are on a 4-point Likert scale with a rating of 1 equating to *not at all* and a rating of 4 equating to *very often*. Subscale means were first calculated for all respondents and then calculated separately for the respondent subgroups of counselors and principals. As shown in Table 13, the means for all respondents are higher in the areas of Counseling, Consultation, Curriculum, and Coordination for what counselors should be doing (Column A) than what counselors are actually doing (Column B).

The means ($M=2.66$) of the perceptions of all respondents for the Other Activities subscales for what counselors should be doing and what they are actually doing were the same. The Other Activities section was composed of non-counseling duties that are not outlined by the ASCA model.

The highest mean for a subscale in Column A ("In my opinion, school counselors should") was that for the Counseling Activities section ($M=3.49$). The lowest subscale mean for Column A was Other Activities ($M=2.66$). The highest mean for a subscale in Column B ("To the best of my knowledge, our school counselors engage in these activities") was that for Consultation Activities ($M=2.81$). The lowest mean for Column B was Curriculum Activities ($M=2.00$).

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics of Both Counselors and Administrators

	Guidance Counselors & Administrators (n=119)	
	Mean	SD
Counseling Activities Should Do	3.49	.41
Counseling Activities Actually Do	2.79	.62
Consultation Activities Should Do	3.29	.47
Consultation Activities Actually Do	2.81	.64
Curriculum Activities Should Do	3.09	.66
Curriculum Activities Actually Do	2.00	.70
Coordination Activities Should Do	3.27	.42
Coordination Activities Actually Do	2.64	.60
Other Activities Should Do	2.66	.48
Other Activities Actually Do	2.66	.35

Subscale means were then calculated separately for the respondent subgroups of counselors and principals. The items for activities that counselors should be doing (Column A) are on a 4-point Likert scale with a rating of 1 equating to *strongly disagree* and a rating of 4 equating to *strongly agree*. The items for activities that counselors are actually doing (Column B) are on a 4-point Likert scale with a rating of 1 equating to *not at all* and a rating of 4 equating to *very often*. As shown in Table 14, the means for both counselors and administrators are higher in the areas of Counseling, Consultation,

Curriculum, and Coordination for what counselors should be doing (Column A) than the means for what counselors are actually doing (Column B).

The mean for counselors for Column A (“In my opinion, school counselors should”) in the Other Activities subscale ($M=2.42$) was lower than the mean in Column B (“To the best of my knowledge, our school counselors engage in these activities”) ($M=2.62$). Thus, counselors believe that they should be doing less than they are actually doing in this area. The mean for administrators for Column A in the Other Activities subscale ($M=2.85$) was higher than the mean in Column B, $M=2.69$. Thus, administrators believe that counselors should be doing more than they are actually doing in this area. The Other Activities section is composed of non-counseling duties that are not outlined by the ASCA model.

The highest subscale mean for counselors in Column A (“In my opinion, school counselors should”) was that for the Counseling Activities section ($M=3.50$). The subscale mean for Counseling Activities was also the highest for administrators ($M=3.48$). The lowest subscale mean for counselors in Column A was that for Other Activities ($M=2.42$). The lowest subscale mean for administrators in Column A was also that for Other Activities ($M=2.85$).

The highest subscale mean for counselors in Column B (“To the best of my knowledge, our school counselors engage in these activities”) was that for Consultation Activities ($M=2.90$). The highest subscale mean for administrators in Column B was that for Counseling Activities ($M=2.78$). The lowest subscale mean for counselors in Column B was that for Curriculum Activities ($M=1.90$). The lowest subscale mean for administrators in Column B was also that for Curriculum Activities ($M=2.06$).

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics of Perceptions of Counselors and Administrators

	Guidance Counselor		Administrator	
	(n=52)		(n=66)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Counseling Activities Should Do	3.50	.41	3.48	.42
Counseling Activities Actually Do	2.77	.55	2.78	.66
Consultation Activities Should Do	3.30	.48	3.28	.47
Consultation Activities Actually Do	2.90	.61	2.72	.67
Curriculum Activities Should Do	3.08	.64	3.11	.69
Curriculum Activities Actually Do	1.90	.64	2.06	.73
Coordination Activities Should Do	3.31	.43	3.25	.41
Coordination Activities Actually Do	2.72	.53	2.58	.64
Other Activities Should Do	2.42	.47	2.85	.40
Other Activities Actually Do	2.62	.35	2.69	.36

Hypotheses Results

Five research questions were generated for this study. Each question had an associated hypothesis. Hypothesis 1 was stated as follows: there is a difference between school counselor and principal perceptions about the roles of school counselors. This hypothesis contrasts the perceptions of principals and counselors in the areas of Counseling, Coordination, Curriculum, Consultation, and Other Activities regarding what

counselors should be doing and what they are actually doing. Subscale means for perceptions about these counselor means are profiled in Table 14. A MANOVA was used to test hypothesis 1. This test revealed a significant difference between the perceptions of principals and counselors regarding the roles of school counselors, as indicated by the Multivariate F-test, $F(10, 107)=3.77, p<.001$. There were no significant differences in the Counseling, Coordination, Consultation, and Curriculum Activities. However, there was a difference between the perceptions of counselors and principals regarding the Other Activities that counselors should be doing. The mean subscale score for administrators' perceptions of what counselors should be doing was significantly higher, statistically speaking, than that for counselors in this area ($F(1,116)=5.39, p<.001$). Therefore the hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis 2 was stated as follows: counselor and principal perceptions are related to the independent variables of counselor-ratio, grade level(s) of school, number of faculty members, location of school district, performance level, years of experience as a counselor or principal, and economic condition of school district. A multiple linear regression was used to test Hypothesis 2. In the area of the counseling activities that counselors actually perform, the model summary reported an R^2 of 0.23 for grade level, indicating the variability explained by the model as 23%. Since the F is the average amount of variability and is used to test the statistical significance of the model, the ANOVA table indicates that the regression was statistically significant with $F(9, 99) = 3.27, p<.001$. These results are shown in Table 15.

Table 15

Coefficients of Counseling Activities

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	4.41	.74		5.98	<.001
Economic Status	-.08	.11	-.08	-.77	.45
North Mississippi	-.69	.61	-.48	-1.13	.26
Central Mississippi	-.62	.61	-.48	-1.01	.31
South Mississippi	-.59	.61	-.46	-.97	.34
Years of Experience	.03	.04	.08	.82	.41
Grade Level	-.58	.12	-.45	-4.75	<.001
Number of Faculty Members	.01	.05	.02	.24	.81
Performance Level	-.11	.06	-.19	-1.98	.05
Counselor Ratio	.46	.54	.09	.85	.40

Note: Dependent Variable: counseling activities actually do

The analysis of Hypothesis 2 continued with the area of the Consultation Activities that counselors actually perform. The model summary reported an R^2 of 0.23 for the performance level of the school and grade level, indicating the variability explained by the model as 23%. Since the F is the average amount of variability and is used to test the statistical significance of the model, the ANOVA table indicates that the

regression was statistically significant with $F(9, 99) = 3.28, p < .001$. These results are shown in Table 16.

Table 16

Coefficients of Consultation Activities

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
(Constant)	3.66	.74		4.94	<.001
Economic Status	.10	.11	.10	.99	.33
North Mississippi	-.42	.61	-.29	-.69	.49
Central Mississippi	-.33	.61	-.25	-.54	.60
South Mississippi	-.21	.61	-.16	-.35	.73
Years of Experience	.08	.04	.18	1.97	.05
Grade Level	-.54	.12	-.41	-4.41	<.001
Number of Faculty Members	-.01	.05	-.01	-.11	.92
Performance Level	-.12	.06	-.21	-2.10	.04
Counselor Ratio	.38	.54	.071	.70	.49

Note: Dependent Variable: consultation activities actually do

The analysis of Hypothesis 2 continued with the area of the Curriculum Activities that counselors actually perform. The model summary reported an R^2 of 0.19 indicating the variability explained by the model as 19% for location and grade level(s) of the school. Since the F is the average amount of variability and is used to test the statistical

significance of the model, the ANOVA table indicates that the regression was statistically significant with $F(9, 99) = 2.58, p < .001$. These results are shown in Table 17.

Table 17

Coefficients of Curriculum Activities

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
(Constant)	2.92	.82		3.59	<.001
Economic Status	.07	.12	.06	.59	.56
North Mississippi	-.49	.67	-.31	-.73	.47
Central Mississippi	-.34	.68	-.24	-.50	.62
South Mississippi	-.67	.67	-.48	-.99	.32
Years of Experience	.04	.05	.09	.93	.36
Grade Level	-.53	.13	-.38	-3.97	<.001
Number of Faculty Members	-.03	.05	-.06	-.58	.56
Performance Level	-.05	.06	-.08	-.75	.45
Counselor Ratio	.88	.60	.15	1.48	.14

Note: Dependent Variable: curriculum activities actually do

The analysis of Hypothesis 2 continued with the area of the Coordination Activities that counselors actually perform. The model summary reported an R^2 of .19, indicating the variability explained by the model as 19%. Since the F is the average

amount of variability and is used to test the statistical significance of the model, the ANOVA table indicates that the regression was not statistically significant. These results are shown in Table 18.

Table 18

Coefficients of Coordination Activities

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
(Constant)	3.17	.76		4.17	<.001
Economic Status	.05	.11	.05	.47	.64
North Mississippi	-.29	.63	-.21	-.47	.64
Central Mississippi	-.25	.63	-.20	-.40	.69
South Mississippi	-.23	.63	-.19	-.37	.71
Years of Experience	.04	.04	.10	1.00	.32
Grade Level	-.22	.13	-.18	-1.78	.08
Number of Faculty Members	.01	.05	.02	.20	.85
Performance Level	-.17	.06	-.30	-2.86	.01
Counselor Ratio	.43	.56	.09	.78	.44

Note: Dependent Variable: coordination activities actually do

The analysis of Hypothesis 2 continued with the area of the Other Activities that counselors actually perform. The model summary reported an R^2 of 0.19 for

performance level and grade level(s) of school indicating the variability explained by the model as 19%. Since the F is the average amount of variability and is used to test the statistical significance of the model, the ANOVA table indicates that the regression was statistically significant with $F(9, 98) = 2.5, p < .001$. These results are as shown in Table 19.

Table 19

Coefficients of Other Activities

	Unstandardized		Standardized		
	Coefficients		Coefficients		
Variables	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig
(Constant)	3.18	.43		7.33	<.001
Economic Status	.09	.06	.14	1.44	.15
North Mississippi	-.10	.36	-.13	-.29	.77
Central Mississippi	-.30	.36	-.41	-.84	.40
South Mississippi	-.20	.36	-.27	-.56	.58
Years of Experience	.02	.02	.09	.91	.36
Grade Level	-.27	.07	-.36	-3.71	<.001
Number of Faculty Members	-.03	.03	-.09	-.93	.36
Performance Level	-.10	.03	-.31	-3.02	<.001
Counselor Ratio	.48	.32	.16	1.51	.13

Note: Dependent Variable: other activities actually do

A multiple linear regression was used to perform the statistically analysis for Hypothesis 2. The results indicated that in the area of Counseling Activities that counselors perform, the grade level(s) of school was the area that was statistically significant. In the area of Consultation Activities that counselors perform, the areas of performance level and grade level(s) of school were found to be statistically significant. In the area of Curriculum Activities that counselors perform, the areas of location and grade level(s) of school were found to be statistically significant. In the area of the Coordination Activities that counselors perform, no area was statistically significant. In the area of the Other Activities that counselors perform, the area of performance level and grade level were statistically significant. Hypothesis 2 was, therefore, supported.

Hypothesis 3 was stated as follows: there is a difference between how often counselors perform tasks and the severity of budget cuts. The question referred to the severity of the budget cuts in the respondents' school districts and the scale was as follows: *none*, *minimal*, *moderate*, and *severe*. The responses in Column B ("To the best of my knowledge, our school counselors engage in these activities") of counselors and principals combined were used in this analysis. Counselors perceived that they performed their duties at a higher level when the district did not suffer from budget cuts in all areas except Other Activities. However, the second highest rate at which the duties were performed was in schools where districts had suffered severely from budget cuts in all areas except Other Activities as shown in Table 20.

Table 20

Descriptives of Economic Factors and Activities

Independent Variable	Budget Cuts	Mean	SD
Counseling	None (n=4)	3.36	.49
Activities	Minimal (n=52)	2.81	.57
Actually Do	Moderate (n=54)	2.64	.58
	Severe (n=9)	3.26	.86
	Total (n=119)	2.78	.62
Consultation	None (n=4)	3.60	.51
Activities	Minimal (n=52)	2.76	.56
Actually Do	Moderate (n=54)	2.74	.63
	Severe (n=9)	3.11	.94
	Total (n=119)	2.81	.64
Curriculum	None (n=4)	2.63	.44
Activities	Minimal (n=52)	1.96	.64
Actually Do	Moderate (n=54)	1.94	.67
	Severe (n=9)	2.33	1.07
	Total (n=119)	2.00	.70

To complete the analyses associated with Hypothesis 3, the researcher employed an ANOVA. In the area of Counseling activities, the schools that did not suffer any

Table 20 (continued)

Independent Variable	Budget Cuts	Mean	SD
Coordination	None (n=4)	3.12	.56
Activities	Minimal (n=52)	2.56	.55
Actually Do	Moderate (n=54)	2.57	.54
	Severe (n=9)	3.06	.95
	Total (n=119)	2.64	.60
Other Activities	None (n=4)	2.78	.38
Actually Do	Minimal (n=52)	2.64	.34
	Moderate (n=53)	2.61	.34
	Severe (n=9)	2.94	.39
	Total (n=118)	2.65	.35

budget cuts reported the highest level in completing tasks ($M=3.35$). The schools that had the next highest were the schools with the most severe budget cuts ($M=3.26$). The schools that reported the lowest rate in completing tasks were the schools with moderate budget cuts ($M=2.64$). Since the F is the average amount of variability and is used to test the statistical significance of the model, the ANOVA table indicates that this area was statistically significant with $F(3, 115) = 4.19, p=.007$.

In the area of Consultation activities, the schools that did not suffer any budget cuts reported the highest level in completing tasks ($M=3.61$). The schools that had the next highest were the schools with the most severe budget cuts ($M=3.11$). The schools that reported the lowest rate in completing tasks were the schools with moderate budget cuts ($M=2.74$). Since the F is the average amount of variability and is used to test the statistical significance of the model, the ANOVA table indicates that this area was statistically significant with $F(3, 115) = 3.156, p=.027$. It should be noted, however, that the N values for the budget cut levels of “none” and “severely” were small.

In the area of Curriculum activities, the schools that did not suffer any budget cuts reported the highest level in completing tasks ($M=2.63$). The schools that had the next highest were the schools with the most severe budget cuts ($M=2.33$). This study did not find a statistically significant relationship between Curriculum Activities and budget cuts.

In the area of Coordination activities, the schools that did not suffer any budget cuts reported the highest level in completing tasks ($M=3.12$). The schools that had the next highest were the schools with the most severe budget cuts ($M=3.06$). The schools that reported the lowest rate in completing tasks were the schools with minimal budget cuts ($M=2.56$). Since the F is the average amount of variability and is used to test the statistical significance of the model, the ANOVA table indicates that this area was statistically significant with $F(3, 115) = 2.78, p=.044$.

In the area of Other Activities, the schools with the most severe budget cuts reported the highest rate of completing tasks, $M=2.94$, the schools that had the next highest rate were the schools with the most severe budget cuts, $M=2.78$. This study did not find a statistically significant relationship between Other Activities and budget cuts.

Hypothesis 4 was stated as follows: there is a difference between the roles of school counselors as defined by ASCA and the roles of school counselors that are actually performed by counselors. This hypothesis combines the perceptions of the principals and counselors to assess whether they perceive that counselors are actually performing the tasks that are defined by ASCA.

To complete the analyses associated with Hypothesis 4, the researcher employed paired t-tests. Data related to this hypothesis are profiled in Table 21. This model did find a statistically significant difference between the roles of school counselors as defined by ASCA and the roles of school counselors that counselors actually perform in the area of Counseling Activities, $t(52) = 9.17, p < .001$. There was a statistically significant difference in the area of Consultation activities $t(52) = 5.42, p < .001$. There was also a statistically significant difference in the area of Curriculum activities $t(52) = 10.38, p < .001$, and there was a statistically significant difference in the area of Coordination activities $t(52) = 9.08, p < .001$. Finally, there was a statistically significant difference in the area of Other Activities $t(51) = -2.79, p < .001$. Hypothesis 4 was, therefore, supported.

Table 21

Paired Samples Test of Counseling Activities

Pair	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Counseling Activities Should Do/Actually Do	9.17	52	<.001

Table 21 (continued)

Pair	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Consultation Activities Should Do/Actually Do	5.42	52	<.001
Curriculum Activities Should Do/Actually Do	10.38	52	<.001
Coordination Activities Should Do/Actually Do	9.08	52	<.001
Other Activities Should Do/Actually Do	-2.79	51	.007

Hypothesis 5 was stated as follows: there is a difference in perceptions between middle grades and high school counselors and principals regarding the roles of school counselors. It should be noted that all schools that had both middle and high school grades were excluded. To complete the analyses associated with Hypothesis 5, the researcher employed a MANOVA. As shown in Table 22, there were significant differences in perceptions between middle grades counselors and principals and high school counselors and principals in the areas of Counseling, Consultation, Coordination, Curriculum, and Other Activities. The perceptions of middle grades counselors and principals combined regarding the tasks that counselors actually perform were higher than those of high school counselors and principals combined, $F(10,97)=4.06$, $p<.001$. Perceptions regarding the roles that school counselors perform were also analyzed by position. There were also statistically significant differences between the perceptions of middle grade principals and those of high school principals and those of middle grade

counselors and high school counselors, $F(10,97)=3.75, p<.001$. It was found that middle grades counselor perceptions of the roles that counselors performed were higher than high school counselors. Middle grades principal perceptions of the roles that counselors performed were higher than high school principals. Hypothesis 5 was, therefore, supported.

Table 22

Descriptives of Middle and High School Counselors & Administrators

	Middle School Counselors & Administrators		High School Counselors & Administrators	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Counseling Activities Do	3.09	.51	2.59	.61
Consultation Activities Do	3.09	.47	2.64	.68
Curriculum Activities Do	2.26	.64	1.82	.64
Coordination Activities Do	2.74	.57	2.59	.62
Other Activities Do	2.78	.34	2.59	.36

Post Hoc Analysis

A post hoc analysis attempted to analyze the significant differences between what counselors and principals believe counselors should be doing ($M=3.09$) and what they are actually doing ($M=3.80$) in relation to coordinating the standardized testing program.

Coordinating the standardized testing program was a task listed in the Other Activities section. A paired sampled t-test found statistically significant differences between what counselors and principals believed counselors should be doing and what they are actually doing in the area of coordinating the standardized testing program. The task of coordinating the standardized testing program had the highest mean ($M=3.80$) in the area of Other Activities.

Summary

This study investigated whether there were differences in perceptions between counselors and principals regarding the roles of school counselors. The study included 119 participants from across the state of Mississippi. Data for this quantitative study were entered into SPSS to be statistically analyzed and reported. Descriptive statistics, ANOVA, MANOVA, paired t-tests, and a multiple linear regression analyses were used to identify statistically significant differences among the variables.

Frequency data from this sample indicated that the majority of the respondents had 5-10 years of experience. Administrators outnumbered the number of counselors who responded. A large number of the respondents were from Central Mississippi, followed by South Mississippi, then North Mississippi. The majority of the respondents worked in schools that were given ratings of Star, High Performing, or Successful schools. The number of middle grades and high school participants were fairly equal. Many of the respondents were in a school with three counselors and had between 700-899 students. Also, many of the respondents came from a school with 50-74 faculty members.

This study indicated that there were significant differences in the perceptions of what counselors should be doing and what they are actually doing in the areas of Counseling, Coordination, Curriculum, Consultation, and Other Activities. This study also showed that there were differences in the perceptions of middle grades and high school counselors regarding the roles that counselors actually perform. Performance level of school, grade level(s) of school, and location also were found to be statistically significant in relation to the roles that school counselors actually perform. There were significant differences between the roles that are defined by ASCA and the roles that counselors actually perform. There were no significant differences in perceptions as a result of economic conditions, number of counselors and students, and years of experience.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to analyze the differences in perceptions between principals and school counselors regarding the roles of school counselors. The study further examined the impact of the economic condition of schools upon perceptions about these roles. This study compares the roles of middle grades counselors and high school counselors. Finally, this study also sought to determine if counselor roles assigned by principals are aligned with the ASCA model.

This intent of this research was to present findings on the disparities in perspectives regarding the roles of counselors. This information can provide policymakers, administrators, and counselors with a foundation for reexamining the responsibilities assigned to counselors and for determining whether these roles help to increase the prospects of effective service to students. The findings of this study may better enable counselors and principals to work together as a team. This chapter includes a summary of the procedures, discussion of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Summary of Procedures

The data for this study were obtained from 119 counselors, assistant principals, and principals from throughout the state of Mississippi. The study examined the differences in perceptions of the roles of school counselors. For this quantitative study, the responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics, ANOVA, MANOVA, multiple linear regression, and paired t-tests.

Permission was granted from The University of Southern Mississippi's Institutional Review Board (IRB) before the study began. Questionnaires were mailed through the United States Postal Service at the end of November, 2011 and collected through the second week of December. The participants returned the questionnaires to the researcher in the self-addressed, stamped envelopes that were provided. Data were compiled and analyzed by the researcher. A Cronbach's alpha test of coefficient reliability was performed on each of the subscales of survey items.

Major Findings

The demographic data from the study indicated that a majority of the respondents, who were middle grades and high school counselors and principals, had between 0 and 10 years of experience. It is possible that these schools had less experienced counselors and administrators due to individuals retiring, or it could be that less experienced survey recipients were more likely to respond. A majority of the respondents worked in high schools. Typically, there are more school counselors and administrators in high schools and this could be the cause of the discrepancy. A large number of respondents reported working in schools with two to three counselors. A number of respondents reported working in schools with a student population between 500-899. The large number of respondents reported having between 50-99 faculty members. There was a fairly proportionate distribution for the location of respondents, who were from North Mississippi, Central Mississippi, and South Mississippi. Most of the respondents came from higher achieving schools in which the performance level was Star, High Performing, or Successful. These are the three highest levels in the Mississippi Accountability Model. It should be noted that there were only 6.7% of participants that

reported their schools' performance level as Academic Watch, Low Performing, At Risk of Failing, or Failing. The low response from the lower performing schools could be because of inaccurate reporting, discomfort of respondents with this particular question, or a heightened unwillingness of administrators and counselors in low performing schools to participate in this survey.

Descriptive statistical summaries indicated that the economic factors in the schools did not, for the most part, impact the school counseling program. Descriptive statistical summaries of the perceptions of both counselors and principals combined also indicated that they believed that counselors are doing less than they believe they should be doing in the areas of Counseling, Consultation, Curriculum, and Coordination. However, in the area of Other Activities (non-counseling duties), the respondents believed that counselors are doing what they believe they should be doing.

Descriptive statistical summaries indicated that school counselors and principals shared similar views of the roles of school counselors in the areas of Counseling, Consultation, Curriculum, and Coordination. They believed that school counselors should be doing more than they are actually doing in these areas. However, differences in perceptions in the area of Other Activities did exist. The Other Activities section is comprised of duties that are not aligned with the ASCA model such as scheduling and clerical duties (ASCA, 2008). Counselors believed that they should perform less of these duties than they are actually performing. On the other hand, principals believed that they should be doing more than they are actually doing in this area.

Research question 1 asked if there was a difference between school counselor and principal perceptions about the roles of school counselors. The MANOVA used to test

the related hypothesis indicated that there were no significant differences in the subscale means for Counseling, Coordination, Consultation, and Curriculum Activities. However, there were differences between the perceptions of counselors and principals in the Other Activities that counselors should be doing.

Research question 2 addressed whether counselor and principal perceptions were related to the independent variables of counselor-ratio, grade level(s) of school, number of faculty members, location of school district, performance level, years of experience as a counselor or principal, and economic condition of school district. A multiple linear regression was used to perform the statistical analysis for the related hypothesis. The results indicated that in the area of Counseling Activities, the grade level(s) of school was the independent variable that was significantly related to perceptions of the roles that counselors perform. In the area of Consultation Activities, the variables of performance level and grade level(s) of school were found to be significantly related to perceptions of the roles that counselors perform. In the area of Curriculum Activities, the variables of location and grade level(s) of school were found to be significantly related to perceptions of the roles that counselors perform. In the area of Coordination Activities, none of the independent variables was significantly related to perceptions of the roles that counselors perform. In the area of the Other Activities, the variables of performance level and grade level were significantly related to perceptions of the roles that counselors perform.

Research question 3 addressed whether there was a difference between how often counselors perform tasks and the severity of budget cuts. An ANOVA was used to perform the statistical analysis for the related hypothesis. The analysis revealed significant differences between the severity of the budget cuts and the activities that

counselors perform in some areas, but not in others. It was perceived that counselors performed the most activities when the district did not suffer from budget cuts in all areas except Other Activities. However, with the exception of Other Activities, the second highest level at which counselors performed their duties was in schools where districts had suffered severely from budget cuts. However, in light of the small numbers of participants describing budget cut levels as “none” and “severely,” this finding should be viewed with some caution. There were also significant differences in the areas of Counseling, Coordination, and Consultation.

Research question 4 addressed whether there was a difference between the roles of school counselors as defined by ASCA and the roles that school counselors actually perform. Paired t-tests were used to perform the statistical analysis for the related hypothesis. There were statistically significant differences in the areas of Counseling, Consultation, Coordination, Curriculum, and Other Activities. The results indicated that counselors are doing less than they should be doing in the ASCA endorsed roles of Counseling, Consultation, Coordination, and Curriculum. In the area of Other Activities, it was perceived that counselors are exceeding what is expected in these roles.

Research question 5 addressed whether there were differences in perceptions between middle grades and high school counselors and principals regarding the roles of school counselors. A MANOVA was used to perform the statistical analysis for the related hypothesis. There were significant differences in perceptions between middle grades and high school counselors and principals in the areas of Counseling, Consultation, Coordination, Curriculum, and Other Activities. Middle grades school counselors and principals believed that middle grades counselors are doing more

counseling tasks than high school counselors and principals perceive that high school counselors are doing.

Discussion

The results from this study suggest that the economic condition of the school has not had a profound impact on school counseling. In general, the respondents disagreed (albeit mildly, given the means) that the current economic climate is affecting counseling resources and counseling programs. This finding is not consistent with recent literature, which asserts that school counseling programs are adversely affected due to the economic crisis (Griffin & Farris, 2010). A school in California was planning to cut the only school counselor in the district (Scott, 2009). Another school district in Harford, CT announced that they were planning to cut 10 school counseling positions (Dorgan, 2008). The current state of the economy is causing schools to have great challenges in meeting the needs of students (Griffin & Farris, 2010).

The disparities among the perceptions of principals and counselors regarding the roles of school counselors were consistent with the literature in some areas, but not in others. Both school counselors and principals believed that they should be doing more than they are actually doing in the areas of Counseling, Consultation, Curriculum, and Coordination. Therefore, there were not any statistically significant differences between these two groups in this part of the analysis. However, in the area of Other Activities, school counselors believed that they should be doing less than they are actually doing, which is consistent with the literature. Principals, on the other hand, believed that they should be doing more than they are actually doing in this area. The Other Activities

section was composed of non-counseling duties that are not aligned with the ASCA model.

Research studies have shown that counselors and principals have different views regarding the roles of school counselors (Fitch, Newby, Ballester, & Marshall, 2001; Baker, 1996). Administrators often delegate the roles of the school counselor and can assign duties that are not aligned with state and national standards (Schmidt, Weaver, & Aldredge, 2001). Some counselors perceive that principals may lack the knowledge of appropriate school counselor roles due to their preparation in administrator programs that do not focus on the roles of school counselors ((Fitch, Newby, Ballester, & Marshall, 2001).

The propensity of principals to assign counselors tasks that are not aligned with the ASCA model is consistent with findings in previous literature. There were statistically significant differences found in this study between the roles of school counselors as defined by ASCA and the roles that school counselors actually perform. Counselors are often involved in activities that are not related to their training or what is determined by the profession to be appropriate roles (Brown, Galassi, & Akos, 2004). Other activities such as coordinating the testing program, performing disciplinary actions, substituting, and performing clerical duties take up a lot of the school counselor's time. It is evident that these are not duties outlined in the model for the roles of school counselors (ASCA, 2008; Baker, 1996; Ballard & Murgatroyd, 1999; Gysbers & Henderson, 1994; Murray, 1995; Schmidt, 1999). Counselors are spending time performing non-counseling duties. As a result, counselors are unable to perform duties associated with state and national standards.

This study supports extant literature in the fact that some areas of counseling such as individual counseling, group counseling, classroom guidance, program coordination, and consultation have been neglected due to the time that counselors spend in non-counseling duties (Brown, Galassi, & Akos, 2004). For example, counselors and principals agreed that the activities listed in the Curriculum Activities section should be conducted by counselors. However, based on the respondents, these activities are rarely conducted. Greene (2004) conducted a study regarding how counseling duties affect student achievement. Many counselors believed they were unable to focus on student-centered activities because of the demands that were put on them for non-guidance activities. Extensive research has been conducted on the extent to which principals endorse the ASCA counselor role standards. The research indicates that principals have been inconsistent in this support (Fitch et al., 2001; McDowell, 1995; Partin, 1990; Schmidt, Weaver, & Aldredge, 2001; Stickel, 1990).

One of the tasks not aligned with the ASCA model is coordinating the school testing program. However, counselors are often tasked with this duty and, based on the results of the current study, school counselors believed that this is a task that counselors should be doing. High-stakes testing has been put into place to ensure that all students have a high-quality education. Schools are held accountable to ensure that students meet with success. School counselors are heavily involved in the high-stakes testing program due to the significant rewards and punishments associated with success or failure on such assessments (Brown, Galassi, & Akos, 2004). School counselors have been tasked with this duty for so long that they appear to believe that this is what they should be doing.

Many studies have been conducted on the effects of high stakes testing on teachers. However, this is not the case for counselors (Brown, Galassi, & Akos, 2004).

The findings outlined in this and the following paragraph should be viewed with caution due to the low number of respondents who reported none or severely as the impact of the budget. This study found that counselors who were affected the least with budget cuts were the counselors who most often perceived that that they were performing counseling duties that are aligned with the ASCA model. Interestingly, the next highest number of counselors who perceived that that they were performing counseling duties that are aligned with the ASCA model were the counselors most affected by budget cuts. This finding does not concur with much of the recent literature. For example, researchers have found that budget cuts have caused counselors to be tasked with roles that are not aligned with state or national standards for school counseling programs (Brown, Galassi, & Akos, 2004; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). It should also be noted that many counselor roles are changing into administrative roles due to budget cuts (ASCA, 2006).

On the other hand, Campbell & Dahir (2001) found that counselors who have been affected severely by budget cuts may work harder to prove the value of their services in order to maintain the position. Counselors often complete tasks that are not aligned with the ASCA model in order to demonstrate their value. Demonstrating their value through accountability metrics can reduce the likelihood that, in a difficult budget climate, their programs might be cut or diminished (Campbell & Dahir, 2001). In general, however, research has shown that some school districts have chosen to reduce teaching and school counseling staff in order to reduce the budget in tough economic times (ASCA, 2006; Dorgan, 2008). For instance, a school district in Hartford, CT

decided to cut 10 school counseling positions and also eliminate other services (Dorgan, 2008; ASCA, 2006).

Counselor-student ratio, grade level(s) of school, number of faculty members, location of school district, performance level, years of experience, and economic condition were tested in regards to the counselor and principal perceptions of school counselor roles. Some areas were not found to be statistically significant, but others were significant. Grade level(s) was found to be significant in the areas of Counseling, Consultation, Curriculum, and Other Activities. Performance level was found to be significant in the areas of Consultation and Other Activities and location was found to be significant in the area of Curriculum Activities. There were no significant differences in any area for the independent variables of number of students, number of faculty members, or years of experience, or economic condition.

The finding of school performance level not being statistically related to perceptions of counseling duties is not consistent with recent research. Research studies have shown that schools with a fully implemented school counseling program can benefit students' academic achievement (Lapan, Gysbers, and Sun, 1997; Lapan, Gysbers, and Petroski, 2001). Research has also shown that certain school counseling activities, such as counseling interventions, have a great impact on students' educational and personal development and school performance (Dahir et al., 2009; ASCA, 2006). However, interpretations of the relationship between perceptions of counselor performance and school effectiveness based on this study need to be approached with caution, since very few low-performing schools were represented in this sample.

This study was conducted using both middle school and high school counselors and principals. There were statistically significant differences between the perceptions of the middle grades counselors and principals and high school counselors and principals regarding the roles of school counselors. Middle grades school counselors and principals believe that middle grades counselors are doing more counseling tasks than high school counselors and high school principals perceive that high school counselors are doing. There is little prior analysis in recent literature of this difference. However, middle school children face many challenges such as puberty, identity development, and an increase in autonomous choice (Akos, 2005). This could be the reason for the findings concerning the perceptions concerning the work of middle school counselors. Also, the ASCA National Model's system in relation to middle school counseling is very unique in design due to the different changes that occur in this age group (ASCA, 2003). Middle school counselors may be more compelled to complete tasks and have more of an opportunity to perform tasks aligned to the ASCA model.

Limitations

There were some factors that limited this study's findings. Participants for the study were limited to school counselors and administrators who work in schools in the state of Mississippi. Also, school counselors used in the study were limited to middle and high school counselors. The response rate, while producing sufficient participants for most analyses, was not as high as desired.

One of the independent variables was the performance level of school. The intent was to determine if performance level of school affected the roles that school counselors

actually perform. However, low-performing schools were poorly represented in the study.

The Cronbach's alpha test of coefficient reliability was performed on each set of items and yielded a reliability of greater than 0.70 for all subscales with the exception of the Other Activities section. The Other Activities section under part b provided a Cronbach's alpha of .51. However, this section was kept due to the fact that it included a wide variety of non-counseling duties. These measures could be slightly unreliable.

One of the independent variables was the economic condition of the school. The intent was to see if the economic condition of the school had an impact on the school counseling program. However, the number of participants who reported the impact of the budget cut levels of "none" and "severely" was very low.

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

Various factors such as high-stakes testing and budget cuts result in counselors being tasked with roles that are not aligned with state or national standards for school counseling programs (Brown, Galassi, & Akos, 2004; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). Based on this study, coordinating the standardized testing program was the non-counseling duty performed most frequently by counselors. Principals and other policymakers should analyze how this task is keeping counselors from performing other duties that are aligned with the ASCA model. The ASCA model is a tool used by school counselors as a guide to implement the roles of school counselors. However, it is often not fully implemented. This model outlines the counseling program in the following areas: foundation, delivery management, and accountability (ASCA, 2005). Many states have adopted the ASCA model, but there is not a set of policies and

procedures to enforce the model. Just as teachers are held accountable for providing high quality instruction to students, policymakers should have accountability systems for comprehensive school counseling program. In light of this study's revelations about the agreement between principals and counselors regarding the duties that should be performed by school counselors, policymakers and governing boards should base such accountability systems on recognized professional standards, such as those developed by ASCA.

There is often of role confusion when it comes to the duties that school counselors should perform and actually perform. Monteiro-Leitner et al. (2006) suggested that some reasons for the role confusion are as follows: (a) All stakeholders do not exactly know what a school counselor's role is and when they do, they do not always agree on the roles; (b) the power given to the administrator can affect the relationship with the school counselor and make it difficult for the counselor to be empowered; and (c) consideration should be given to the economic, regional, local, and individual student needs when changing the daily function of school counselors (Monteiro-Leitner, et al., 2006).

Principals often task counselors with duties that are not aligned with the ASCA model. Many times, principals base their actions relative to the counseling program on their own experience of counselors when they were in school (Coy, 1999). Policymakers should ensure that universities offer at least one course in counseling as a part of a degree in educational administration. Beale and McCay (2001) and Fitch et al. (2001) concluded that a course such as this is uncommon. Offering a course in counseling will allow future administrators to better understand the roles of school counselors. The criteria for

evaluating principal effectiveness might also be amended to include their management of school counseling programs in a manner consistent with accepted professional standards.

The differences in perceptions between school counselors and principals regarding the roles of school counselors suggest that counselors need to use accountability measures to communicate the importance of their role. Sink (2009) recommended that accountability be demonstrated through evaluation of three dimensions: (a) composition, configuration, organization, and implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program (CSCP); (b) management and coordination of the school personnel who are responsible for CSCP implementation; and (c) level of program impact on student learning. When principals assign counselors tasks, the counselor should be able to communicate how and if these tasks fit into the comprehensive school counseling program. This study suggests the need for counselors and principals to better understand the roles of school counselors. School counselors are becoming more and more overwhelmed by the number of responsibilities that they have to perform, especially when many of these tasks are non-counseling duties (ASCA, 2008; Baker, 1996; Ballard & Murgatroyd, 1999; Gysbers & Henderson, 1994; Murray, 1995; Schmidt, 1999). Counselors need to become their own advocates by becoming leaders in the school and communicating their value through accountability metrics. Universities who are preparing future counselors should teach counselors to understand and advocate for their roles as school counselors. Moreover, policymakers and administrators need to listen to the concerns and needs of counselors.

Administrators should support the counselor's role in the school. In the ancillary findings, statistically significant differences were found between what counselors and

principals believed counselors should be doing and what they are actually doing in the area of coordinating the standardized testing program. Based on these findings, counselors and principals believe counselors are conducting the task of coordinating the standardized testing program more often than they should be doing. The task of coordinating the standardized testing program had the highest mean in the area of Other Activities. The Other Activities section included tasks that are not aligned with the ASCA model. If counselors are spending most of their time coordinating the testing program, performing clerical duties, assigning discipline, and other non-counseling duties, they will not be able to fulfill tasks that are upheld by the counseling profession, and agreed upon, at least in principle, by administrators. More importantly, they will not be able to adequately meet the needs of students. Students need to be teachable and an effective way for this to happen is for counselors to aid in removing barriers that may impede student learning.

Recommendations for Future Research

Many times research yields the opportunity to investigate further. These findings reveal additional opportunities for future inquiry. The following studies would produce additional understanding of the roles of school counselors.

1. The findings of this study suggested that middle grades counselors are perceived as performing the tasks that they should be performing more frequently than high school counselors. It is recommended that future studies explore the differences between middle school counselor roles and high school counselor roles.
2. In order to have a more representative sample of counselors and principals, it

is recommended that future studies include larger sample sizes of counselors and principals to expand the reliability of these studies.

3. Future studies are recommended on the effects of universities including a course on counseling in education administration programs.

4. Low performing schools were not well represented in this study. It is recommended that future studies include a more representative sample of these schools.

5. The ASCA Model is a tool used by school counselors as a guide to implement the roles of school counselors. Future studies that examine the familiarity of school counselors with the model are recommended.

6. Future studies are recommended on the relationship between school counselors and principals as it relates to the Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory. This will provide an understanding of how these relationships affect the roles of school counselors.

7. Coordinating the school testing program is not deemed by the profession to be a counseling duty. However, counselors are often tasked with this duty. Future studies that examine the effects of the testing program on counselors are recommended.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to analyze the differences in perceptions between principals and school counselors regarding the roles of school counselors. The study further examined the impact of the economic condition of schools upon perceptions about these roles. Previous literature discusses the role confusion of school counselors.

The primary data for this study were obtained from 119 counselors, assistant principals, and principals from throughout the state of Mississippi. The study examined

the differences in perceptions of the roles of school counselors. The responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics, ANOVA, MANOVA, multiple linear regression, and paired t-tests. The differences in perceptions of the roles of school counselors were found to be consistent with previous studies in some areas and yet not significant in other areas.

Several major findings came from this study. The findings indicated that there are significant differences in the perceptions of what counselors should be doing and what they are actually doing in the areas of Counseling, Coordination, Curriculum, Consultation, and Other Activities. The results of this study suggest that school counselors should be performing tasks associated with the ASCA model more consistently than they are actually performing them. The study also showed that there were differences in the perceptions of middle grades and high school counselors and principals regarding the roles that counselors actually undertake. Middle grades school counselors and principals believe that middle grades counselors are doing more counseling tasks than high school counselors and principals perceive that high school counselors are doing.

Performance level of school, grade level(s) of school, and location also were found to be statistically significant in relation to perceptions about the roles that school counselors actually perform. There were significant differences between perceptions about the roles that are defined by ASCA and the roles that counselors actually perform. School counselors are doing more non-counseling duties than they perceive should be doing. They are also performing fewer tasks than they perceive appropriate in the areas of Counseling, Coordination, Curriculum, and Consultation. There were no significant

differences in perceptions as a result of economic conditions, number of counselors and students, and years of experience.

Limitations existed in this study. However, recommendations for policy and practice were made which could include policymakers establishing policies and procedures to enforce the ASCA model and having universities incorporate a class on school counselors in educational administration programs. A recommendation was made for administrators to support the roles of school counselors that are aligned with the ASCA model. Finally, recommendations for counselors include becoming leaders and advocates for the roles of school counselors and implanting an accountability system to demonstrate their value.

Recommendations for further research included implementing further studies regarding the roles of middle school and high school counselors. Another recommendation was to identify the effects of implementing a course on school counselors in education administration programs. Other recommendations included exploring the relationships between counselors and principals as related to the LMX theory, researching how well school counselors are familiar with the ASCA model, and examining the effects of school counselors on the testing program.

APPENDIX A

PERCEPTIONS OF THE ROLES OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS QUESTIONNAIRE

Part I
Demographics

1. What is your position in your school district?
☐ Guidance Counselor
☐ Assistant Principal
☐ Principal
2. How many years of experience do you have in your current professional role (principal, assistant principal, counselor)?
☐ <5 ☐ 5-10 ☐ 10-15
☐ 15-20 ☐ 20-25 ☐ 25+
3. How many counselors are in your school?
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4
☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8
4. How many students are in your school?
☐ <100 ☐ 100-299 ☐ 300-499 ☐ 500-699
☐ 700-899 ☐ 900-1099 ☐ 1100-1299 ☐ 1300-1499
☐ 1500-1699 ☐ 1700-1899 ☐ 1900-2099 ☐ 2100-2299
☐ 2300-2500 ☐ > 2500
5. What grade level(s) are at your school?
☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8
☐ 9 ☐ 10 ☐ 11 ☐ 12
6. How many faculty members are in your school?
☐ <25 ☐ 25-49 ☐ 50-74 ☐ 75-99
☐ 100-124 ☐ 125-149 ☐ 150-174 ☐ 175-199
☐ 200-224 ☐ 225-249 ☐ 250-274 ☐ 275-299
☐ >300
7. What area of Mississippi is your school located?
☐ North Mississippi ☐ Central Mississippi ☐ South Mississippi
8. What is the performance level of your school?
☐ Star ☐ High Performing ☐ Successful

- ☐ Academic Watch
☐ At Risk of Failing

- ☐ Low Performing
☐ Failing

Part II Economic Factors

1. To the best of my knowledge, regarding budget cuts, my district has suffered _____ None _____ minimally _____ moderately _____ severely in the last school year.

2. What is the percentage of students who participate in the free/reduced lunch program in your school?

_____ <25% _____ 26%-50%
 _____ 51%-74% _____ 75%-100%

For the following questions please circle the number that corresponds beside the response that best matches your perspective.

3. The budget reductions have impacted the school counseling program.

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3= Agree 4=Strongly Agree

4. The number of counselors has been reduced as a result of the budget cuts.

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3= Agree 4=Strongly Agree

5. Budget cuts have prompted changes in the roles of school counselors.

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3= Agree 4=Strongly Agree

6. Counselors in this school have enough resources to adequately provide services to students.

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3= Agree 4=Strongly Agree

7. Instructional programs have been cut due to budget cuts.

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3= Agree 4=Strongly Agree

8. Counselors are able to attend trainings throughout the year concerning the roles, responsibilities, and effective practice of school counselors.

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3= Agree 4=Strongly Agree

Part III Activities
Counseling Activities

A. In my opinion, school counselors should:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

B. To the best of my knowledge, our school counselors engage in these activities:

Not at all	Rarely	Often	Very Often
1	2	3	4

1. Counsel with students regarding personal/family concerns

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

2. Counsel with students regarding school behavior

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

3. Counsel students regarding crisis/emergency issues

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

4. Counsel with students regarding relationships (e.g., family, friends, romantic)

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

5. Provide small group counseling addressing relationship/social skills

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

6. Provide small group counseling for academic issues

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

7. Conduct small groups regarding family/personal issues (e.g., divorce, death)

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

8. Conduct small group counseling for students regarding substance abuse issues (own use or family/friend use)

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

9. Follow-up on individual and group counseling participants

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

10. Counsel students regarding academic issues

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

Part III Activities Consultation Activities

A. In my opinion, school counselors should:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

B. To the best of my knowledge, our school counselors engage in these activities:

Not at all	Rarely	Often	Very Often
1	2	3	4

11. Consult with school staff concerning student behavior

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

12. Consult with community and school agencies concerning individual students

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

13. Consult with parents regarding child/adolescent development issues

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

14. Coordinate referrals for students and/or families to community or education professionals (e.g., mental health, speech pathology, medical assessment)

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

15. Assist in identifying exceptional children (special education)

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

16. Provide consultation for administrators (regarding school policy, programs, staff and/or students)

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

17. Participate in team / grade level / subject team meetings

A: 1	2	3	4	B: 1	2	3	4
------	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

Part III Activities
Curriculum Activities

A. In my opinion, school counselors should:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

B. To the best of my knowledge, our school counselors engage in these activities:

Not at all	Rarely	Often	Very Often
1	2	3	4

18. Conduct classroom activities to introduce yourself and explain the counseling program to all students

A: 1 2 3 4 **B:** 1 2 3 4

19. Conduct classroom lessons addressing career development and the world of work

A: 1 2 3 4 **B:** 1 2 3 4

20. Conduct classroom lessons on various personal and/ or social traits (e.g., responsibility, respect, etc.)

A: 1 2 3 4 **B:** 1 2 3 4

21. Conduct classroom lessons on relating to others (family, friends)

A: 1 2 3 4 **B:** 1 2 3 4

22. Conduct classroom lessons on personal growth and development issues

A: 1 2 3 4 **B:** 1 2 3 4

23. Conduct classroom lessons on conflict resolution

A: 1 2 3 4 **B:** 1 2 3 4

24. Conduct classroom lessons regarding substance abuse

A: 1 2 3 4 **B:** 1 2 3 4

25. Conduct classroom lessons on personal safety issues

A: 1 2 3 4 **B:** 1 2 3 4

Part III Activities
Coordination Activities

A. In my opinion, school counselors should:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

B. To the best of my knowledge, our school counselors engage in these activities:

Not at all	Rarely	Often	Very Often
1	2	3	4

26. Coordinate special events and programs for school around academic, career, or personal/social issues (e.g., career day, drug awareness week, test prep)

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

27. Coordinate and maintain a comprehensive school counseling program

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

28. Inform parents about the role, training, program, and interventions of a school counselor within the context of your school

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

29. Conduct or coordinate parent education classes or workshops

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

30. Coordinate school-wide response for crisis management and intervention

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

31. Inform teachers / administrators about the role, training, program, and interventions of a school counselor within the context of your school

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

32. Conduct or coordinate teacher in-service programs

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

33. Keep track of how time is being spent on the functions that you perform

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

34. Attend professional development activities (e.g., state conferences, local in-services)

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

Part III Activities
Coordination Activities (Con't)

A. In my opinion, school counselors should:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

B. To the best of my knowledge, our school counselors engage in these activities:

Not at all	Rarely	Often	Very Often
1	2	3	4

35. Coordinate with an advisory team to analyze and respond to school counseling program needs

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

36. Formally evaluate student progress as a result of participation in individual/group counseling from student, teacher and/or parent perspectives

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

37. Conduct needs assessments and counseling program evaluations from parents, faculty and/or students

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

38. Coordinate orientation process / activities for students

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

Part III Activities
Other Activities

A. In my opinion, school counselors should:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

B. To the best of my knowledge, our school counselors engage in these activities:

Not at all	Rarely	Often	Very Often
1	2	3	4

39. Participate on committees within the school

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

40. Coordinate the standardized testing program

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

41. Organize outreach to low income families (i.e., Thanksgiving dinners, Holiday families)

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

42. Respond to health issues (e.g., check for lice, eye screening, 504 coordination)

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

43. Perform hall, bus, cafeteria duty

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

44. Schedule students for classes

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

45. Enroll students in and/or withdraw students from school

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

46. Maintain/Complete educational records/reports (cumulative files, test scores, attendance reports, drop-out reports)

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

47. Handle discipline of students

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

48. Substitute teach and / or cover classes for teachers at your school

A: 1 2 3 4 B: 1 2 3 4

Scarborough, J. L. (2005). The School Counselor Activity Rating Scale: An instrument for gathering process data. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(3), 274-283.

APPENDIX B

PERMISSION TO USE AND ADAPT SURVEY INSTRUMENT

RE: Instrument - Yahoo! Mail

Page 1 of 1



RE: Instrument

Thursday, June 9, 2011 11:38 AM

From: "Scarborough, Janna Lynn" <SCARBORO@mail.etsu.edu>
To: "Tyra Bailey" <tyra.bailey@yahoo.com>

Tyra,

Thank you for your interest in the SCARS. You are welcome to use the instrument for your stated purpose. If possible, I do like a summary of findings. Good luck to you.
-Janna

Janna L. Scarborough, Ph.D., NCC, NCSC, LMHC
Acting Associate Department Chair,
Human Development & Learning
Associate Professor of Counseling and
Counseling Program Coordinator

Human Development & Learning
East Tennessee State University
PO Box 70548
Johnson City, TN 37614-0685
(423) 439-4191
www.etsu.edu/coe/hdal/counseling/default.asp

Show up. Pay attention. Tell your truth. Don't get too attached to the outcome.

From: Tyra Bailey [mailto:tyra.bailey@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2011 4:22 PM
To: Scarborough, Janna Lynn
Subject: Instrument

Dr. Scarborough,

Good afternoon. My name is Tyra Bailey and I am pursuing a Doctorate in Education Administration. I am currently a school counselor at a high school. I am currently writing a dissertation on the differences in perceptions of school counselors and principals regarding the roles of school counselors. I am seeking permission to use the School Counselor Activity Rating Scale and modify it for my study. Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you.

Tyra Bailey

APPENDIX C

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER


**THE UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI**

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
118 College Drive #5147 | Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001
Phone: 601.266.6820 | Fax: 601.266.4377 | www.usm.edu/irb

NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
 - The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
 - The selection of subjects is equitable.
 - Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
 - Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
 - Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
 - Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
 - Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
 - If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months.
- Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: **11092603**
PROJECT TITLE: **School Counselor and Principal Perceptions
Regarding the Roles of School Counselors**
PROJECT TYPE: **Dissertation**
RESEARCHER/S: **Tyra Bailey**
COLLEGE/DIVISION: **College of Education & Psychology**
DEPARTMENT: **Educational Leadership & School Counseling**
FUNDING AGENCY: **N/A**
IRB COMMITTEE ACTION: **Exempt Approval**
PERIOD OF PROJECT APPROVAL: **10/17/2011 to 10/16/2012**

Lawrence A. Hosman

Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board Chair

10-21-2011

DATE

APPENDIX D

ADULT CONSENT FOR RESEARCH & PARTICIPANT LETTER

**University of Southern Mississippi
118 College Drive #5147
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001
(601)266-6820**

Consent to Participate in a Research Study

Date: November 28, 2011

**Title of Study: School Counselor and Principal Perceptions Regarding the Roles of
School Counselors**

Research will be conducted by: Tyra Bailey (228) 547-8060

Email Address: tyra.bailey@yahoo.com

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Mike Ward

What are some general things you should know about research studies?

You are being asked to take part in a research study. To join the study is voluntary. You may refuse to join, or you may withdraw your consent to be in the study, for any reason, without penalty.

Research studies are designed to obtain new knowledge. This new information may help people in the future. You may not receive any direct benefit from being in the research study. There also may be risks to being in research studies.

Details about this study are discussed below. It is important that you understand this information so that you can make an informed choice about being in this research study. You will be given this consent form for review and by filling out the survey you will be consenting to participate. You should ask the researchers named above, or staff members who may assist them, any questions you have about this study at any time.

What is the purpose of this study?

The purpose of this research study is to examine the perceptions of the roles of school counselors held by principals and school counselors.

How many people will take part in this study?

If you decide to be in this study, you will be one of approximately 100 people in this research study.

How long will your part in this study last?

You will be asked to read the consent form and fill out a questionnaire, which will last no longer than 15 minutes. A report of my findings will be made available to you upon request at the conclusion of this study by emailing me at tyra.bailey@yahoo.com.

What will happen if you take part in the study?

You will be asked to read the consent form and fill out a questionnaire. The researcher will collect data from the questionnaire. Throughout the process of analysis, the researcher will keep the questionnaire in a locked box. The questionnaire will be shredded upon completion of this project.

What are the possible benefits from being in this study?

The benefit of the study will be the contribution of the findings to a better understanding of the roles of school counselors. The study will provide insights for counselors, administrators, and policymakers into the differences between prescribed professional practice for counselors and the roles that counselors are asked to fulfill. The results may better enable school counselors and principals to work together as a team. Participants should request a summary from tyra.bailey@yahoo.com.

What are the possible risks or discomforts involved from being in this study?

The risks are that the respondents may not feel comfortable answering questions regarding the activities that they engage in and expressing their opinions regarding the roles/activities in which counselors should be engaged; these concerns may be allayed by the assurances of confidentiality for respondents that will be provided. Only the researcher and faculty advisors will view the participant responses. All responses will be kept secure and locked in the researcher's home. Questionnaires will be destroyed after one year.

How will your privacy be protected?

Participants will not be identified in any report or publication about this study. Questionnaires will be collected and placed in a lock box. Only researcher and faculty advisors will view these questionnaires. Questionnaires will be kept secure and locked in the researcher's home. Questionnaires will be shredded after a year.

What if you have questions about this study?

You have the right to ask, and have answered, any questions you may have about this research. If you have questions, or concerns, you should contact the researchers listed on the first page of this form.

What if you have questions about your rights as a research participant?

This project has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research subject should be directed to the chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

November 28, 2011

Dear Participant,

I am currently a doctoral candidate at the University of Southern Mississippi. I am conducting a research study on the perceptions of principals and counselors regarding the roles of school counselors. Please take a few moments of your time to complete the enclosed questionnaire. The survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. Upon completion, this information will be shared with my dissertation committee.

The data collected from the completed questionnaires will be compiled and analyzed. All data collected is anonymous. All information gathered will be kept completely confidential. To ensure confidentiality of the school and participants, no one will be identified by name including the school district or the name of the school. Upon completion of this research study, I will shred all surveys. As the researcher, I am very appreciative for your participation; your completed questionnaire will serve as your consent to participate as well as the consent form. However, you have the option to decline to participate if you so wish. If you decide to withdraw from participation at any time there is no penalty or risk of negative consequences.

As a part of this study, I will be asking counselors and principals to complete a survey to gather data that can provide insights for counselors, administrators, and policymakers into the differences between prescribed professional practice for counselors and the roles that counselors are asked to fulfill. If you agree to participate, please return the survey with the self-addressed, stamped envelope. Should you have any questions please contact: Tyra Bailey, email: tyra.bailey@yahoo.com; phone: 228.547.8060. This research is conducted under the supervision of Dr. Michael Ward, The University of Southern Mississippi, email: mike.ward@usm.edu.

This research project has been reviewed and approved by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that all research fits the federal guidelines for research involving human subjects. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research subject should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

Sincerely,

Tyra Terrell Bailey

REFERENCES

- Akos, P. (2005). The unique nature of middle school counseling. *Professional School Counseling, 9*(2), 95-103.
- Amatea, E. S., & Clark, M. A. (2005). Changing schools, changing counselors: A qualitative study of school administrators' conceptions of the school counselor role. *Professional School Counseling, 9*(1), 16-27.
- American School Counselor Association. (2003). *The ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- American School Counselor Association. (2005). *The ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs* (2nded.). Alexandria, VA: Author.
- American School Counselor Association. (2006). *Careers and roles*. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolcounselor.org>.
- American School Counselor Association. (2008). *The ASCA National Model*. Alexandria, VA: Timberlake Publishing. Retrieved from <http://www.ascanationalmodel.org>.
- Anderson, R., & Reiter, D. (1995). The indispensable counselor. *School Counselor, 42*(4), 268-276.
- ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs. (2003). *Professional School Counseling, 6*(3), 165-168.
- Baker, S. B. (1996). *School counseling for the twenty-first century*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bakery, S.B. (2000). *School counseling for the twenty-first century* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

- Baker, S. B., & Gerler, E. R., Jr. (2004). *School counseling for the twenty-first century* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Ballard, M.B., & Murgatroyd, W. (1999). Defending a vital program: School counselors define their roles. School counselors: A bridge to success [Special Issue]. *NAASP Bulletin*, 83(603), 2-8.
- Bandura, A. (1969). *Principles of behavior modification*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologists*, 37(2), 122-147.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Freeman.
- Beale, A. V., & McCay, E. (2001). Selecting school counselors: What administrators should look for in prospective counselors. *Clearing House*, 74(5), 257-261.
- Beehr, T., Beehr, M., Wallwey, D., Glaser, K., Beehr, D., & Erofeev, D. (2006). The nature of satisfaction with subordinates: Its predictors and importance to supervisors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(6), 1523-1547.
- Beesley, D. (2004). Teachers' perceptions of school counselor effectiveness: Collaborating for student success. *Education*, 125(2), 259-270.
- Better Mississippi Report. (2011). *Updated Monday night: Barbour releases new budget, still cuts education funds*. Retrieved from <http://www.bettertermsreport.com/2011/03/barbournewbudget/>

- Betz, N. E. (1992). Counseling uses of career self-efficacy theory. *Career Development Quarterly*, 41(1), 22-26.
- Betz, N. E., & Hackett, G. (1981). The relationship of career-related self-efficacy expectations to perceived career options in college woman and men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28(5), 399-410.
- Bodenhorn, N., & Skaggs, G. (2005). Development of the school counselor self-efficacy scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 38(2), 14-28.
- Bodenhorn, N., Wolfe, E., & Airen, O. (2010). School counselor program choice and self-efficacy: Relationship to achievement gap and equity. *Professional School Counseling*, 13(3), 165-174.
- Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Borders, L.D., & Drury, S. M. (1992). Comprehensive school counseling programs: A review for policymakers and practitioners. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70(4), 487-498.
- Brown, D., Galassi, J., & Akos, P. (2004). School counselors' perceptions of the impact of high-stakes testing. *Professional school counseling*, 8(1), 31-39.
- Burnham, J., & Jackson, C. (2000). School counselor roles: Discrepancies between actual practice and existing models. *Professional School Counseling*, 4(1), 41-49.
- Butler, S. K., & Bunch, L. K. (2005). Response to EGAS: An innovative approach to prevent high school failure for at-risk urban African American girls. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(5), 395-397.

- Campbell, C. A., & Dahir, C. A. (2001). *Sharing the vision: The national standards for counseling programs*. Alexandria, VA: American School Counseling Association.
- Chata, C., & Loesch, L. (2007). Future school principals' views of the roles of professional school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 11*(1), 35-41.
- Clark, M. A., & Amatea, E. (2004). Teacher perceptions and expectations of school counselor contributions: Implications for program planning and training. *Professional School Counseling, 8*(2), 132-140.
- Clemens, E., Milson, A., & Cashwell, C. (2009). Using leader-member exchange theory to examine principal-school counselor relationships, school counselors' roles, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. *Professional School Counseling, 13*(2), 75-85.
- Cobia, D. C., & Henderson, D. A. (2003). *Handbook of school counseling*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Coy, D. R. (1999). The role and training of the school counselor: Background and purpose. *NAASP Bulletin, 83*(603), 2-8.
- Dahir, C., & Stone, C. (2003). Accountability: A M.E.A.S.U.R.E. of the impact school counselors have on student achievement. *Professional School Counseling, 6*(3), 214-221.
- Dahir, C., Burnham, J., & Stone, C. (2009). Listen to the voices: School counselors and comprehensive school counseling programs. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(3), 182-192.

- Daniels, J. A., & Larson, L. M. (2001). The impact of performance feedback on counseling self-efficacy and counselor anxiety. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*(2), 120-130.
- Devoss, J. A., & Andrews, M. F. (2006). *School counselors as educational leaders*. Boston: Lahaska Press.
- Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review, 11*(3), 618-634.
- Dollarhide, C. T. (2003). School counselors as program leaders: Applying leadership contexts to school counseling. *Professional School Counseling, 6*(5), 304-308.
- Dollarhide, C. T., Gibson, D. M., & Saginak, K.A. (2008). New counselors' leadership efforts in school counseling: Themes from a year-long qualitative study. *Professional School Counseling, 11*(4), 262-271.
- Dorgan, B. L. (2008). President Bush's budget proposal shortchanges education programs. Retrieved from <http://dpc.senate.gov/dpcdoc.cfm?doc%5fname=fs-110-2-27>
- Dunegan, K. J., Uhl-Bien, M., & Duchon, D. (2002). LMX and subordinate performance: The moderating effects of task characteristics. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17*(2), 275-285.
- Education Trust. (1997). *Working definition of school counseling*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Fitch, T., Newby, E., Ballester, V., & Marshall, J. (2001). Future school administrators' perceptions of the school counselor's role. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 41*(2), 89-99.

- Foster, L. H., Young, J. S., & Hermann, M. (2005). The work activities of professional school counselors: Are the national standards being addressed? *Professional School Counseling, 8*(4), 313-321.
- Freedman, J., & Combs, G. (1996). Narrative therapy: The social construction of preferred realities. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Galassi, J. P., Griffin, D., & Akos, P. (2008). Strengths-based school counseling and the ASCA National Model. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(2), 176-181.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(6), 827-844.
- Ginn, S. J. (1924). Vocational guidance in Boston public schools. *Vocational Guidance Magazine, 3*(1), 3-7.
- Ginter, E. J., Scalise, J. J., & Presse, N. (1990). The elementary school counselor's role: Perceptions of teachers. *School Counselor, 38*(1), 19-23.
- Graen, G., & Cashman, J. F. (1975). A role making model in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larsons (Eds.), *Leadership frontiers* (pp. 143-165). Kent, OH: Kent State.
- Graen, G. B., Novak, M. A., & Sommerkamp, P. (1982). The effects of ladder-member exchange and job design on productivity and satisfaction: Testing a dual attachment model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 30*(1), 109-131.
- Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, (Vol. 9, pp. 175-208). Netherlands: JAI Press.

- Graen, G. B., & Schiemann, W. (1978). Leader member agreement: A vertical dyad linkage approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(2), 206-212.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1991). The transformation of professionals into self-managing and partially self-designing contributors: Toward a theory of leader-making. *Journal of Management Systems*, 3(3), 33-48.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Greene, Robie C. (2004). School guidance counselors: Comparing duties of counselors in level one and level five schools and how those duties affect student achievement. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations. (Publication No. AAT 3165232).
- Griffin, D., & Farris, A. (2010). School counselors and collaboration: Finding resources through community asset mapping. *Professional School Counseling*, 13(5), 248-256.
- Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (1994). Developing and managing your school guidance program (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Gysbers, N., & Henderson, P. G. (2000). Developing and managing your school guidance program (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Gysbers, N., & Henderson, P. (2001). Comprehensive guidance and counseling programs: A rich history and a bright future. *Professional School Counseling*, 4(4), 246-256.

- Hatch, T., & Chen-Hayes, S. (2008). School counselor beliefs about ASCA National Model school counseling program components using the SCPCS. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(1), 34-42.
- House, R. M., & Hayes, R. L. (2002). School counselors becoming key players in school reform. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(4), 249-256.
- House, R. M., & Martin, P. J. (1998). Advocating for better futures for all students: A new vision for school counselors. *Education, 119*(2), 284-291.
- Housley, W. F., McDaniel, L. C., & Underwood, J. R. (1990). Mandated assessment of counselors in Mississippi. *School Counselor, 37*(4), 294-302.
- Humes, C. W. (1978). School counselors and PL 94-142. *School Counselor, 25*(3), 193-195.
- Issacs, M. L. (2003). Data driven decision making: The engine of accountability. *Professional School Counseling, 6*(4), 288-295.
- Johnson, N., Koulish, J., & Oliff, P. (2009, February 10). Most states are cutting education. Retrieved from <http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=2220>
- Johnson, S. K., & Johnson, C. D. (1990-1991). The new guidance: A systems approach to pupil personnel programs. *California Association of Counseling and Development Journal, 11*, 5-13.
- Johnson-Reid, M. (2008). Accountability meets appropriation: The case of the elementary and secondary school counseling program. *Children & Schools, 30*, 3-4.
- Kaplan, L. S. (1995). Principals versus counselors: Resolving tensions from different practice models. *School Counselor, 42*(4), 261-267.

- Kirchner, G., & Setchfeld, M. (2005). School counselors' and school principals' perceptions of the school counselor's role. *Education, 126*(1), 10-17.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1999). *Encourage the heart*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2003). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lambie, G., & Williamson, L. (2004). The challenge to change from guidance counseling to professional school counseling: A historical proposition. *Professional School Counseling, 8*(2), 124-131.
- Lapan, R. (2001). Results-based comprehensive guidance and counseling programs: A framework for planning and evaluation. *Professional School Counseling, 4*(4), 289-299.
- Lapan, R., Gysbers, N., & Kayson, M. (2007). *Missouri school counselors benefit all students: How implementing comprehensive guidance programs improves academic achievement for all Missouri students*. Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Jefferson City, MO.
- Lapan, R. T., Gysbers, N. C., & Petroski, G. G. (2001). Helping seventh graders be safe and successful: A statewide study of the impact of comprehensive guidance and counseling programs. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 79*(3), 320-330.
- Lapan, R. T., Gysbers, N. C., & Sun, Y. (1997). The impact of more fully implemented guidance programs on the school experiences of high school students: A statewide evaluation study. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 75*(4), 292-302.

- Larson, L. M., & Daniels, J. A. (1998). Review of counseling self-efficacy literature. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26*(2), 179-218.
- Leach, M. M., & Stoltenberg, D. D. (1997). Self-efficacy and counselor development: Testing the integrated developmental model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 37*(2), 115-124.
- Lenox, R. A., & Subich, L. M. (1994). The relationship between self-efficacy beliefs and inventoried vocational interests. *Career Development Quarterly, 42*(4), 302-313.
- Lent, R. W., Hill, C. E., & Hoffman, M. A. (2003). Development and validation of the counselor activity self-efficacy scales. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*(1), 97-108.
- Liden, R. C., & Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management, 24*(1), 43-72.
- Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. In G.R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personal and human resources management* (Vol. 15, pp. 47-119). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Loesch, L. C., & Ritchie, M. H. (2005). *The accountable school counselor*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- Martin, I., Carey, J., & DeCoster, K. (2009). A national study of the current status of state school counseling models. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(5), 378-386.

- Mason, E., & McMahon, H. (2009). Leadership practices of school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 13*(2), 107-115.
- McAuliffe, G. J. (1992). Assessing and changing career decision-making self-efficacy expectations. *Journal of Career Development, 19*(1), 25-36.
- McDowell, D. K. (1995). *Role perception study of school counselors*. (Research/Technical Report 143). Huntsville, TX: Sam Houston State.
- McMahon, H., Mason, E., & Paisley, P. (2009). School counselor educators as educational leaders promoting systemic change. *Professional School Counseling, 13*(2), 116-124.
- Mercer, R. (1981). Stress and the guidance counselor. *The School Guidance Worker, 37*(2), 13-16.
- Monteiro-Leitner, J., Asner-Self, K., Milde, C., Keitner, D., & Skelton, D. (2006). The role of the rural school counselor: Counselor, counselor-in-training, and principal perceptions. *Professional School Counseling, 9*(3) 248-251.
- Muro, J. J., & Kottman, T. (1995). *Guidance and counseling in the elementary and middle schools: A practical approach*. Dubuque, IA: Brown and Benchmark.
- Murray, B. S. (1995). Validating the role of the school counselor. *School Counselor, 43*(1), 5-9.
- Myrick, R. D. (2003). Accountability: Counselors count. *Professional School Counseling, 6*(3), 174-189.
- Myrick, R. D. (2003). *Developmental guidance and counseling: A practical approach* (4th ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Educational Media.

- Napierkowski, C. M., & Parsons, R. D. (1995). Diffusion of innovation: Implementing changes in school counselor roles and functions. *School Counselor*, 42(5), 364-369.
- Nelson, J., Robles-Pina, R., & Nichter, M. (2008). An analysis of Texas high school counselor's roles: Actual and preferred counseling activities. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory and Research*, 36(1), 30-46.
- Nims, D., James, S., & Hughey, A. (1998). The challenge of accountability: A survey of Kentucky school counselors. *Kentucky Counseling Association Journal*, 31-37.
- Paglis, L. L., & Green, S. E. (2002). Both sides now: Supervisor and subordinate perspectives on relationship quality. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(2), 250-276.
- Paisley, P. O., & Mahon, G. H. (2001). School counseling for the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities. *Professional School Counseling*, 5(2), 106-122.
- Paisley, P. O., & Milsom, A. (2007). Group work as an essential contribution to transforming school counseling. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 32(1), 9-17.
- Paisley, P. O., Ziomek-Daigle, J., Getch, Y. Q., & Bailey, D. F. (2006). Using state standards to develop professional school counselor identify as both counselors and educators. *Guidance & Counseling*, 21(3), 143-151.
- Partin, R. (1990, March). *School counselor's time: A comparison of counselors' and principals' perceptions and desires*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Counseling Association, Cincinnati, OH.

- Perera-Diltz, D., & Mason, K. (2010). An exploration of accountability practices of school counselors: A national study. *Professional Counseling, Practice, Theory, and Research*, 38(1), 52-70.
- Perusse, R., Goodnough, G. E., Donegan, J., & Jones, C. (2004). Perceptions of school counselors and school principals about the national standards for school counseling programs and the transforming school counseling initiative. *Professional School Counseling*, 7(3), 152-161.
- Poidevant, J. M. (1991). C. H. Patterson: A personal view. *Elementary School Guidance & Counseling*, 26(2), 83-95.
- Posner, N., & Kouzes, J. (1988). Development and validation of the Leadership Practices Inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurements*, 48(2), 483-496.
- Poynton, T. A., Schumach, R. A., & Wilczenski, F. L. (2008). School counselors' attitudes regarding statewide comprehensive developmental guidance model implementation. *Professional School Counseling*, 11(6), 417-422.
- Rau, J., & Halper, E. (2009, January 26). Proposed cuts foretell state's plight: Even as the budget fight continues, both parties have endorsed hits to transportation, school, the disabled. *Los Angeles Times*, p. A1.
- Reiner, S., Colbert, R., & Perusse, R. (2009). Teacher perceptions of the professional school counselor role: A national study. *Professional School Counseling*, 12(5), 324-332.
- Remley, T. P., & Albright, P. L. (1988). Expectations for middle school counselors: Views of students, teachers, principals, and parents. *School Counselor*, 35, 290-296.

- Scarborough, J. L. (2005). The school counselor activity rating scale: An instrument for gathering process data. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(3), 274-283.
- Scandura, T. A., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1994). Leader-member exchange and supervisor career mentoring as complementary constructs in leadership research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(6), 1588-1602.
- Schiarra, D. T. (2004). *School counseling: Foundations and contemporary issues*. Belmont, CA: Brooks Cole.
- Schlossberg, S. M., Morris, J. D., & Lieberman, M. G. (2001). The effects of a counselor-led guidance intervention on students' behaviors and attitudes. *Professional School Counseling*, 4(3), 156-174.
- Schmidt, J. J. (1995). Assessing school counseling programs through external reviews. *School Counselor*, 43(2), 114-123.
- Schmidt, J. J. (1999). *Counseling in schools: Essential services and comprehensive programs* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Schmidt, J. J. (2003). *Counseling in the schools: Essential services and comprehensive programs* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Schmidt, J., Weaver, F., & Aldredge, A. (2001). *Perceptions of school counselor's role and satisfaction by newly hired counselors and principals in eastern North Carolina* (Research Report 143). Greenville, NC: Eastern Carolina University.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Neider, L. L., & Scandura, T. A. (1998). Delegation and leader-member exchange: Main effects, moderators, and measurement issues. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(3), 298-318.

- Schwallie-Giddis, P., ter Maat, M., & Pak, M. (2003). Initiating leadership by introducing and implementing the ASCA National Model. *Professional School Counseling, 6*(3), 170-173.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theory and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 1-65). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Scott, J. (2009, March 3). Coastside school districts mull budget cuts. *San Mateo County Times*. Retrieved from <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi%5fq4176/is%5f20090302/ai%5fn3140497>
- 6
- Scruggs, M.Y., Wasielewski, R. A., & Ash, M. J. (1999). Comprehensive evaluation of a K-12 counseling program. *Professional School Counseling, 2*(3), 244-247.
- Sears, S. J., & Granello, D. H. (2002). School counseling now and in the future: A reaction. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(3), 164-171.
- Shillingford, M., & Lambie, G. (2010). Contribution of professional school counselors' values and leadership practices to their programmatic service delivery. *Professional School Counseling, 13*(4), 208-217.
- Shoffner, M. F., & Williamson, R. D. (2000). Engaging preservice school counselors and principals in dialogue and collaboration. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 40*(2), 128-140.
- Sink, C. A. (2009). School counselors as accountability leaders: Another call for action. *Professional School Counseling, 13*(2), 68-74.

- Sink, C. A., & Yillik-Downer, A. (2001). School counselors' perceptions of comprehensive guidance and counseling programs: A national survey. *Professional School Counseling, 4*(4), 278-289.
- Sink, C., Akos, P., Turnbull, R., & Mvududu, R. (2008). An investigation of comprehensive school counseling programs and academic achievement in Washington state middle schools. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(1), 43-53.
- Sparrowe, R. T., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Process and structure in leader-member exchange. *Academy of Management Review, 22*(2), 522-552.
- Stickel, S. (1990, February). *A study of role congruence between school counselors and school principals*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Clearwater, FL.
- Stringer, L. (2006). The link between the quality of the supervisor-employee relationship and the level of the employee's job satisfaction. *Public Organization Review, 6*(2), 125-142.
- Stone, C.B., & Dahir, C. A. (2006). *The transformed school counselor*. Boston, MA: Lahaska Press.
- Stone, C. B., & Dahir, C. A. (2007). *School counselor accountability: A M.E.A.S.U.R.E. of student success* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Sutton, F., & Fall, M. (1995). The relationship of school climate factors to counselor self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 73*(3), 331-336.
- Super, D. E. (1955). Transition: From vocational guidance to counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 2*(1), 3-9.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2002).

About SASA. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oeese/sasa/aboutus.html>

U.S. Department of Education. (2010). *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*.

Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/publicationtoc.html>

Walsh, M. E., Barrett, J., & DePaul, J. (2007). Day-to-day activities of school counselors: Alignment with new directions in the field and the ASCA National Model. *Professional School Counseling, 10*(4), 370-378.

Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 40*(1), 82-111.

Whiston, S. C., & Sexton, T. L. (1998). A review of school counseling outcome research: Implications for practice. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 76*(4), 412-426.

Whiston, S., & Quinby, R. (2009). Review of school counseling outcome research. *Psychology in the Schools, 46*(3), 267-272.

White, F. A. (2007). The professional school counselor's challenge: Accountability. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory, and Research, 35*(2), 62-70.